

RESOLUTION NO. PC-2019-04

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY
OF ROCKLIN APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Stanford Ranch Storage
(DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004)

WHEREAS, the City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator prepared an Initial Study on the Stanford Ranch Storage project (DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004) (the "Project") which identified potentially significant effects of the Project; and

WHEREAS, revisions to and/or conditions placed on the Project, were made or agreed to by the applicant before the mitigated negative declaration was released for public review, were determined by the environmental coordinator to avoid or reduce the potentially significant effects to a level that is clearly less than significant and that there was, therefore, no substantial evidence that the Project, as revised and conditioned, would have a significant effect on the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study and mitigated negative declaration of environmental impacts were then prepared, properly noticed, and circulated for public review.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Rocklin as follows:

Section 1. Based on the Initial Study, the revisions and conditions incorporated into the Project, the required mitigation measures, and information received during the public review process, the Planning Commission of the City of Rocklin finds that there is no substantial evidence that the Project, as revised and conditioned, may have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 2. The mitigated negative declaration reflects the independent judgment of the Planning Commission.

Section 3. All feasible mitigation measures identified in the City of Rocklin General Plan Environmental Impact Reports which are applicable to this Project have been adopted and undertaken by the City of Rocklin and all other public agencies with authority to mitigate the project impacts or will be undertaken as required by this project.

Section 4. The statements of overriding considerations adopted by the City Council when approving the City of Rocklin General Plan Update are hereby readopted for the purposes of this mitigated negative declaration and the significant identified impacts of this project related to aesthetics, air quality, traffic circulation, noise, cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources, and climate change and greenhouse gases.

Section 5. A mitigated negative declaration of environmental impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared in connection with the Project, attached hereto as Attachment 1 and incorporated by this reference, are approved for the Project.

Section 6. The Project Initial Study is attached as Attachment 1 and is incorporated by reference. All other documents, studies, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission has based its decision are located in the office of the Rocklin Community Development Director, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677. The custodian of these documents and other materials is the Rocklin Community Development Director.

Section 7. Upon approval of the Project by the Planning Commission, the environmental coordinator shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of Placer County and, if the project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to the provisions of section 21152(a) of the Public Resources Code and the State EIR Guidelines adopted pursuant thereto.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of March, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners: McKenzie, Barron, Vass, Whitmore

NOES: Commissioners: None

ABSENT: Commissioners: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioners: Alatorre



Brian Whitmore, Chairman

ATTEST:



Terry Stemple, Secretary



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF ROCKLIN**

3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, California 95677
(916) 625-5160

ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Stanford Ranch Storage

DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004

1400 West Stanford Ranch Road, in the City of Rocklin

APNs 017-086-009 (portion), 017-086-010 (portion) and 017-086-011

February 22, 2019

PREPARED BY:

Sharon Cohen, Environmental Services and Housing Specialist, (916) 625-5592

CONTACT INFORMATION:

This Initial Study has been prepared by the City of Rocklin, as Lead Agency, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any questions regarding this document should be addressed to David Mohlenbrok at the City of Rocklin Community Development Department, Planning Division, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677 (916) 625-5160.

APPLICANT/OWNER:

The applicant is Timothy Alatorre and the property owner is Fort Sutter Company.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 for the purpose of providing decision-makers and the public with information regarding environmental effects of proposed projects; identifying means of avoiding environmental damage; and disclosing to the public the reasons behind a project's approval even if it leads to environmental damage. The City of Rocklin has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, preparation of an initial study is required.

An initial study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the lead agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the initial study concludes that the project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report should be prepared; otherwise the lead agency may adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

This Initial Study (IS) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Rocklin CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the West Oaks Self-Storage project. The document relies on a combination of a previous environmental document and site-specific studies to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the proposed project. In particular, this Initial Study assesses the extent to which the impacts of the proposed project have already been addressed in the certified Final Environmental Impact Report for the Rocklin General Plan, as adopted by the Rocklin City Council on October 9, 2012 (the "General Plan EIR").

B. Document Format

This Initial Study is organized into five sections as follows:

Section 1, Introduction: provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section 2, Summary Information and Determination: Required summary information, listing of environmental factors potentially affected, and lead agency determination.

Section 3, Project Description: provides a description of the project location, project background, and project components.

Section 4, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts: provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the screening from the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist.

Section 5, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this Initial Study.

C. CEQA Process

To begin the CEQA process, the lead agency identifies a proposed project. The lead agency then prepares an initial study to identify the preliminary environmental impacts of the proposed project. This document has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to analyze the possible environmental impacts of the project so that the public and the City of Rocklin decision-making bodies (Planning Commission, and/or City Council) can take these impacts into account when considering action on the required entitlements.

SECTION 2. INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY AND DETERMINATION

A. Summary Information

Project Title:

Stanford Ranch Storage

Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Rocklin, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677

Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Mohlenbrok, Director of Community Development, 916-625-5162

Project Location:

The project site is generally located on the south side of West Stanford Ranch Road, approximately 500 feet east of Sunset Boulevard (1400 West Stanford Ranch Road), in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 017-086-009 (portion), 017-086-010 (portion) and 017-086-011.

Project Sponsor's Name:

The applicant is Timothy Alatorre and the property owner is Fort Sutter Company.

Current and Proposed General Plan Designation: Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI)

Current and Proposed Zoning: Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) and Planned Development Light Industrial (PD-LI)

Description of the Project:

The Stanford Ranch Storage project proposes the construction and operation of a new 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility consisting of eleven one-story metal storage buildings totaling 86,469 +/- square feet and a two-story wood framed building which is for the office (1,200 +/- square feet) and residential use of the live-in manager’s unit (1,280 +/- square feet), with 239 RV and boat storage spaces on a 9.8 +/- acre site. The project would have access onto West Stanford Ranch Road and West Oaks Boulevard. This project will require Design Review and Conditional Use Permit entitlements. For a more detailed project description, please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

To the north of the project site are West Stanford Ranch Road and beyond that office buildings for Oracle and Esurance. To the east of the project site are the Villas at Stanford Ranch Senior Living Facility, Wickman Park, single-family homes and office uses. To the south of the project site are the UNFI warehouse facility, West Oaks Boulevard, a self-storage facility and a small retail commercial use. To the west of the project site are a Verifone office building, a gas station and additional retail commercial buildings and to the northwest is the Placer County Human Services – Rocklin offices.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required (e.g., Permits, Financing Approval, or Participation Agreement):

- Rocklin Engineering Division approval of Improvement Plans
- Rocklin Building Inspections Division issuance of Building Permits
- Placer County Water Agency construction of water facilities
- South Placer Municipal Utility District construction of sewer facilities

B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

Those factors checked below involve impacts that are “Potentially Significant”:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Sig.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None After Mitigation				

C. Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study:

- I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that as originally submitted, the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment; however, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent which will avoid these effects or mitigate these effects to a point where clearly no significant effect will occur. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached Environmental Checklist. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, to analyze the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

David Mohlenbrok
Director of Community Development

Date

SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The project site is generally located on the south side of West Stanford Ranch Road, approximately 500 feet east of Sunset Boulevard (1400 West Stanford Ranch Road), in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 017-086-009 (portion), 017-086-010 (portion) and 017-086-011. (Please see Attachment A, Vicinity Map).

The City of Rocklin is located approximately 25 miles northeast of Sacramento, and is within the County of Placer. Surrounding jurisdictions include: unincorporated Placer County to the north and northeast, the City of Lincoln to the northwest, the Town of Loomis to the east and southeast, and the City of Roseville to the south and southwest.

B. Description

The Stanford Ranch Storage project proposes the construction and operation of a new 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility consisting of eleven one-story metal storage buildings totaling 86,469 +/- square feet and a two-story wood framed building which is for the office (1,200 +/- square feet) and residential use of the live-in manager's unit (1,280 +/- square feet), with 239 RV and boat storage spaces on a 9.8 +/- acre site. The project would have access onto West Stanford Ranch Road and West Oaks Boulevard. The eleven storage structures will be constructed of lightweight steel framing on concrete slabs, and will be sized at 3,300, 3,900, 5,600, 7,150, 7,500, 8,145, 8,250, 9,050, 9,600, 11,6700 and 12,375 square feet. The storage units being rented come in typical sizes of 5x5, 5x10, 10x10, 10x15, 10x20 and 10x 30. The project includes modifications to the existing Verifone parking lot and the construction of a pavilion on the Verifone property. The architectural design of the proposed project mimics the architectural elements, colors and features of the adjacent Verifone building. This project will require the following entitlements from the City of Rocklin: Design Review for the landscaping, architectural design, colors and materials, and a Conditional Use Permit to allow a self-storage facility in the Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) and Planned Development Light Industrial (PD-LI) zoning districts.

The project site is vacant but is adjacent to the commercial Verifone office building to the west. It is anticipated that site development will involve clearing and grading of the site, trenching and digging for underground utilities and infrastructure, and ultimately the construction of new driveways, buildings, and landscaping. Access to the project would be via a driveway connection from east-bound West Stanford Ranch Road and west-bound West Oaks Blvd that would allow left-in, right-in and right-out movements.

SECTION 4. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Explanation of CEQA Streamlining and Tiering Utilized in this Initial Study

This Initial Study will evaluate this project in light of the previously approved General Plan EIR, which is hereby incorporated by reference. This document is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and can also be found on the City's website under Planning Department, Publications and Maps.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provides a means of streamlining analysis for qualifying projects. Under Section 15183, effects are not considered "peculiar to the project or the parcel" if they are addressed and mitigated by uniformly applied development policies and standards adopted by the City to substantially mitigate that effect (unless new information shows that the policy or standard will not mitigate the effect). Policies and standards have been adopted by the City to address and mitigate certain impacts of development that lend themselves to uniform mitigation measures. These policies and standards include those found in the Oak Tree Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 17.77), the Flood Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.16), the Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30), and the Goals and Policies of the Rocklin General Plan. Where applicable, the Initial Study will state how these policies and standards apply to the project. Where the policies and standards will substantially mitigate the effects of the proposed project, the Initial Study concludes that these effects are "not peculiar to the project or the parcel" and thus need not be revisited in the text of the environmental document for the proposed project.

This Initial Study has also been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15063 and 15168. Section 15063 sets forth the general rules for preparing Initial Studies. One of the identified functions of an Initial Study is for a lead agency to "[d]etermine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project's effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration... The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration." (CEQA Guidelines, section 15063, subd. (b)(1)(C).) Here, the City has used this initial study to determine the extent to which the General Plan EIR or the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Area EIR has "adequately examined" the effects of the proposed project.

Section 15168 sets forth the legal requirements for preparing "program EIRs" and for reliance upon program EIRs in connection with "[s]ubsequent activities" within the approved program. (See *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 598, 614-617.) The General Plan EIR was a program EIR with respect to its analysis of impacts associated with eventual buildout of future anticipated development identified by the General Plan. Subdivision (c) of section 15168 provides as follows:

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
- (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.
 - (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.
 - (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions on the project.
 - (4) Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.

Consistent with these principles, this Initial Study serves the function of a “written checklist or similar device” documenting the extent to which the environmental effects of the proposed project “were covered in the program EIR” for the General Plan. As stated below, the City has concluded that the impacts of the proposed project are “within the scope” of the analysis in the General Plan EIR. Stated another way, these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR.” Where particular impacts were not thoroughly analyzed in prior documents, site-specific studies were prepared for the project with respect to impacts that were not “adequately examined” in the General Plan EIR, or were not “within the scope” of the prior analysis. These studies are hereby incorporated by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the Rocklin Community Development Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677. The specific studies are listed in Section 5, References.

The Initial Study is a public document to be used by the City decision-makers to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the City as lead agency, finds substantial evidence that any effects of the project were not “adequately examined” in the General Plan EIR or were not “within the scope” of the analysis in that document AND that these effects may have a significant effect on the environment if not mitigated, the City would be required to prepare an EIR with respect to such potentially significant effects. On the other hand, if the City finds that these unaddressed project impacts are not significant, a negative declaration would be appropriate. If in the course of analysis, the City identified potentially significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation measures to which the applicant agrees, the impact would be considered to be reduced to a

less than significant level, and adoption of a mitigated negative declaration would be appropriate.

B. Significant Cumulative Impacts; Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Rocklin City Council has previously identified the following cumulative significant impacts as unavoidable consequences of urbanization contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan, despite the implementation of all available and feasible mitigation measures, and on that basis has adopted a statement of overriding considerations for each cumulative impact:

1. Air Quality:

Development in the City and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin as a whole will result in the following: violations of air quality standards as a result of short-term emissions from construction projects, increases in criteria air pollutants from operational air pollutants and exposure to toxic air contaminants, the generation of odors and a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts.

2. Aesthetics/Light and Glare:

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in substantial degradation of the existing visual character, the creation of new sources of substantial light and glare and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, existing visual character and creation of light and glare.

3. Traffic and Circulation:

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in impacts to segments and intersections of the state/interstate highway system.

4. Noise

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in impacts associated with exposure to surface transportation and stationary noise sources, and cumulative transportation noise impacts within the Planning area.

5. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in cumulative impacts to historic character.

6. Biological Resources

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in the loss of native oak and heritage trees, the loss of oak woodland habitat, and cumulative impacts to biological resources.

7. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.

C. Mitigation Measures Required and Considered

It is the policy and a requirement of the City of Rocklin that all public agencies with authority to mitigate significant effects shall undertake or require the undertaking of all feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior environmental impact reports relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment. Project review is limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project which were not addressed as significant effects in the General Plan EIR or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the General Plan EIR. This Initial Study anticipates that feasible mitigation measures previously identified in the General Plan has been, or will be, implemented as set forth in that document, and evaluates this Project accordingly.

D. Evaluation of Environmental Checklist:

- 1) A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site elements, cumulative as well as project-level impacts, indirect as well as direct impacts, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) If a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.
- 4) Answers of “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” describe the mitigation measures agreed to by the applicant and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less

than significant level. Mitigation measures and supporting explanation from earlier EIRs or Negative Declaration may be cross-referenced and incorporated by reference.

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, and the City intends to use tiering. All prior EIRs and Negative Declarations and certifying resolutions are available for review at the Rocklin Community Development Department. In this case, a brief discussion will identify the following:
 - a) Which effects are within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether such effects are addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis; and
 - b) For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

E. Environmental Checklist

I.	<u>AESTHETICS</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
	Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	
b)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X		
c)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.				X	
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of a new self-storage facility totaling approximately 93,459 +/- square feet (storage facility and manager's office/residence) on a 9.8 +/- acre site will change the existing visual nature or character of the project site and area. The development of the project site would create new sources of light and glare typical of urban development. As discussed below, impacts to scenic vistas or viewsheds would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a "program EIR" under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the visual character of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. When previously undeveloped land becomes developed, aesthetic impacts include changes to scenic character and new sources of light and glare (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.3-1 through 4.3-18). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Elements, and

include policies that encourage the use of design standards for unique areas and the protection of natural resources, including open space areas, natural resource areas, hilltops, waterways and oak trees, from the encroachment of incompatible land use.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite the goals and policies addressing visual character, views, and light and glare, significant aesthetic impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will change and degrade the existing visual character, will create new sources of light and glare and will contribute to cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, existing visual character and creation of light and glare. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for aesthetic/visual impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Scenic Vista - No Impact. While vacant or mostly vacant areas have a natural aesthetic quality, there are no designated scenic vistas within the City of Rocklin or Planning Area. Alteration of mostly vacant and undeveloped areas of the project site through the construction of a self-storage facility would change the visual quality of the project site and surrounding area. However, since there are no designated scenic vistas, no impact would occur in this regard.

b. Visual Quality – Less than Significant Impact. The construction of a self-storage facility is consistent with the type of development contemplated and analyzed for this area of Rocklin within the Rocklin General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR analysis included the development of this site with business professional, commercial and light industrial development. The building structures that are anticipated are of consistent height and scale with the zoning and land use designations of the site and with surrounding existing business professional, commercial and light industrial development and anticipated future development, and there are no unusual characteristics of the project which would introduce incompatible elements or create aesthetic impacts not considered in the prior EIR. Existing buildings in the area include one-story and multi-story business professional, commercial and light industrial buildings. These buildings and the anticipated future development of buildings within the nearby and adjacent business professional, commercial and light industrial land use designations are collectively all of similar size and scale to the proposed project.

All development in the Rocklin Planning Area is subject to existing City development standards set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance which helps to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community. In addition, as noted above, this project will also be subject to the City's Design Review Guidelines which help to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community.

The change in the aesthetics of the visual nature or character of the site and the surroundings is consistent with existing surrounding development and future nearby development that is anticipated by the City's General Plan. As noted above, the General Plan EIR concluded that development under the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable aesthetic impacts and a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these cumulative impacts. The project does not result in a change to the finding because the site would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development and the proposed project is consistent with the Business Professional, Commercial and Light Industrial land use designation that was assumed in the General Plan EIR analysis.

c. Scenic Highway and Scenic Resources – No Impact. The City of Rocklin does not contain an officially designated state scenic highway. State Route 65 (SR 65) borders the western portion of the City and is nearby the project site, but it is not considered a scenic highway. Likewise, Interstate 80 (I-80) traverses the eastern portion of the City but does not have a scenic designation. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and no impacts are anticipated in association with damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

d. Light and Glare – Less than Significant Impact. There are no specific features within the proposed project that would create unusual light and glare. Implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the General Plan policies addressing light and glare would also ensure that no unusual daytime glare or nighttime lighting is produced. However, the impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the Planning Area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated.

The General Plan EIR acknowledged that impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the Planning Area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated. As noted above, the General Plan EIR concluded that development under the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable aesthetic impacts and a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these cumulative impacts. The project does not result in a change to the finding because the site would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development and the proposed project is consistent with the Business

Professional, Commercial and Light Industrial land use designation that was assumed in the General Plan EIR analysis.

II. <u>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</u> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:					
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?				X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

There are no agricultural or forestry impacts for the project or project site due to a lack of these resources on the project site, as further discussed below.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b., and c. Farmland, Williamson Act, Cumulative Loss of Farmland - *No Impact.* The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) land classifications system monitors and documents land use changes that specifically affect California’s agricultural land and is administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC). The FMMP land classification system is cited by the State CEQA Guidelines as the preferred information source for determining the agricultural significance of a property (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). The CDC, Division of Land Resource Protection, Placer County Important Farmland Map of 2014 designates the project site as Urban and Built-Up and Grazing Land. This category is not considered Important Farmland under the definition in CEQA of “Agricultural Land” that is afforded consideration as to its potential significance (See CEQA Section 21060.1[a]), nor is it considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance; therefore the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Also, the project site contains no parcels that are under a Williamson Act contract. Because the project would not convert important farmland to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing agricultural or forestry use zoning or Williamson Act contracts, or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses, there would be no agricultural use impacts.

d. and e. Conversion of Forest Land – *No Impact.* The project site contains no parcels that are considered forestry lands or timberland. Because the project would not conflict with existing forestry use zoning or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, and there would be no impact on forestry resources.

III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan?			X		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

In the short-term, air quality impacts from the proposed project will result from construction related activities associated with grading and excavation to prepare the site for the installation of utilities and above ground structures and improvements. These air quality impacts will primarily be related to the generation of airborne dust (Particulate Matter of 10 microns in size or less (PM₁₀)).

In the long term, air quality impacts from the proposed project will result from vehicle trip generation to and from the project site and the resultant mobile source emissions of air pollutants (primarily carbon monoxide and ozone precursor emissions).

As discussed below, self-storage facility developments of this type would not be expected to create objectionable odors.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to regional air quality as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included 8-hour ozone attainment, short-term construction emissions, operational air pollutants, increases in criteria pollutants, odors, and regional air quality impacts. (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.2-1 through 4.2-43). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use, the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation, and the Circulation Elements, and include policies that encourage a mixture of land uses, provisions for non-automotive modes of transportation, consultation with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), and the incorporation of stationary and mobile source control measures.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals and policies, significant air quality impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan and other development within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) as a whole will result in the following: violations of air quality standards as a result of short-term emissions from construction projects, increases in criteria air pollutants from operational air pollutants and exposure to toxic air contaminants, the generation of odors and a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for air quality impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis report for the proposed project. The report, dated October 23, 2018, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

The analysis was prepared to estimate the criteria pollutant emissions from project construction and operation. The Stanford Ranch Storage project's short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod modeling program. CalEEMod estimates the emissions that result from various land uses, and includes considerations for trip generation rates, vehicle mix, average trip length by trip type, and average speed. Where project-specific data was available, that data was input into the CalEEMod model (i.e., construction phases and timing).

The vehicle trips generated by the proposed self-storage facility project would be less than the number of trips that could be generated if the project site was developed per the existing Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use and zoning designations (that existed at the time that the analysis for the 2011 General Plan Environmental Impact Report was conducted). Based on trip generation rates from the Rocklin Traffic Model and the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (9th edition), the proposed Self-storage facility project would generate 233 daily trips (93,459 square feet X 2.5 daily trips/1000 gross square feet). Conversely, development of the same 9.8 acres per the existing Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial designation would conservatively be expected to generate between 1,135 daily trips (9.8 acres X 43,560 sf/acre = 426,888 sf X 0.35 floor-to-area ratio=149,410 X 7.6 trips/1000 sf for a Light Industrial use) to 3,735 daily trips if the site were developed with a commercial use (9.8 acres x 43,560 sf/acre = 426,888 X 0.25 floor-to-area ratio = 106,722 X 35 trips/1000 sf for Commercial). Thus, the proposed project would generate 899 to 3,502 fewer daily trips on local roads and the project would result in overall fewer emissions as compared to the emission that would be generated by a light industrial project

allowed by the Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use and zoning designations.

Construction Emissions

During construction of the project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate on the project site. Construction exhaust emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction workers’ commute, and construction material hauling for the entire construction period. The aforementioned activities would involve the use of diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment that would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants. Project construction activities also represent a source of fugitive dust, which includes particulate matter (PM) emissions. As construction of the proposed project would generate air pollutant emissions intermittently within the site and the vicinity of the site, until all construction has been completed, construction is a potential concern because the proposed project is in a non-attainment area for ozone and PM.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including, but not limited to, the following, which would be noted with City-approved construction plans:

- § Rule 202 related to visible emissions; Rule 217 related to asphalt paving materials; Rule 218 related to architectural coatings; Rule 228 related to fugitive dust, and Regulation 3 related to open burning.

The analysis found that the overall project’s maximum daily emissions from construction operations would be as follows:

MAXIMUM CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (lbs/day)			
	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrous Oxides (NOx)	Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)
Maximum Daily Emissions	46.62	71.83	32.37
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	82	82	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

As shown, the project’s short-term construction-related emissions are not anticipated to exceed the PCAPCD’s significance thresholds for emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM₁₀ and mitigation measures would not be required.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be generated by the proposed project from both mobile and stationary sources. Day-to-day activities such as vehicle trips to and from the project site would make up the majority of the mobile emissions. Emissions would occur from stationary sources such as natural gas combustion from heating mechanisms, landscape maintenance equipment exhaust, and consumer products (e.g., deodorants, cleaning products, spray paint, etc.). The modeling performed for the project takes these factors into consideration.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, such as those listed previously for construction, as well as the following for operations:

- § Rule 225 related to wood-burning appliances, and Rule 246 related to water heaters.

The analysis found that the overall project’s maximum operational emissions on a daily basis would be as follows:

OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day)			
	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrous Oxides (NO_x)	Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)
Maximum Daily Emissions	3.01	3.28	1.33
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	55	55	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

As shown, the project’s operational emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the project’s operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD’s nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and operationally-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Air Quality

Due to the dispersive nature and regional sourcing of air pollutants, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants, including ozone and PM, is a result of past and present development, and, thus, cumulative impacts related to these pollutants could be considered cumulatively significant.

The project is part of a pattern of urbanization occurring in the greater Sacramento ozone nonattainment area. The growth and combined vehicle usage, and business activity within the nonattainment area from the project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within Rocklin and surrounding areas, could either delay attainment of the standards or require the adoption of additional controls on existing and future air pollution sources to offset emission increases. Thus, the project could cumulatively contribute to regional air quality health effects through emissions of criteria and mobile source air pollutants.

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS, and thus result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM₁₀ are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's operational-level thresholds, the project could be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans, and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As shown in the Operational Emissions table above, the proposed project would result in the generation of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds. The General Plan EIR identified a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact. The project does not result in a change to this finding because the site is being developed with a Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use that is the same land use that was anticipated by and analyzed within the General Plan EIR.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b. and c. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project area is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The SVAB is designated nonattainment for the federal particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) and the State particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) standards, as well as for both the federal and State ozone standards. The federal Clean Air Act requires areas designated as federal nonattainment to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures for states to use to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. In compliance with regulations, the PCAPCD periodically

prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions via regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Ozone Attainment Plan), adopted September 26, 2013. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) determined the Plan to be adequate and made such findings effective August 25, 2014. On January 9, 2015, the USEPA approved the 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan.

The 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the CAA requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the USEPA also strengthened the secondary 8-hour ozone NAAQS, making the secondary standard identical to the primary standard. The SVAB remains classified as a severe nonattainment area with an attainment deadline of 2027. On October 26, 2015 the USEPA released a final implementation rule for the revised NAAQS for ozone to address the requirements for reasonable further progress, modeling and attainment demonstrations, and reasonably available control measures (RACM) and reasonably available control technology (RACT). With the publication of the new NAAQS ozone rules, areas in nonattainment must update their ozone attainment plans and submit new plans by 2020/2021.

General conformity requirements of the regional air quality plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. In order to evaluate ozone and other criteria air pollutant emissions and support attainment goals for those pollutants that the area is designated nonattainment, the PCAPCD has recently proposed updates to the District's recommended significance thresholds for emissions of PM₁₀, and ozone precursors – reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x).

The significance thresholds, expressed in pounds per day (lbs/day), listed in the table above are the PCAPCD's updated recommended thresholds of significance for use in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with proposed development projects. The City of Rocklin, as lead agency, is considering a phased in approach of the newly proposed thresholds but for this analysis is utilizing the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for CEQA evaluation purposes. Thus, if a project's emissions exceed the PCAPCD's pollutant thresholds presented above, the project could have a significant effect on air quality, the attainment of federal and State AAQS, and could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Through the combustion of fossil fuels, motor vehicle use produces significant amounts of pollution. In fact, the PCAPCD cites motor vehicles as a primary source of pollution for residential, commercial, and industrial development. Because motor vehicles emit air quality

pollutants during their operations, changing the amount of motor vehicle operations in an area would change the amount of air pollutants being emitted in that area.

As shown in the Construction Emissions table above, the project's construction emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. As shown in the Operational Emissions table above, the project's operational emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ would not exceed the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance.

The air quality modeling performed for construction emissions took into account the application of the City of Rocklin's standard conditions of approval that address construction emissions and despite the application of those conditions, an exceedance of ROG emissions during construction activities was still projected.

Accordingly, the project's construction and operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and construction-related and operationally-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

d. Sensitive Receptors – Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the development of a self-storage facility with a manager's residence; thus, the project would introduce a sensitive receptor (on-site manager) to the area. The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the project site would be the existing the Villas at Stanford Ranch Senior Living Facility and the single-family residences to the east of the project site and the Knowledge Tree Children's Academy to the west of the project site. Emissions of CO would result from the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels such as gasoline or wood and are particularly related to traffic levels. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadways are a direct function of traffic volume, speed and delay. Transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. However, under specific meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near roadways and/or intersections may reach unhealthy levels at nearby sensitive land uses, such as residential units, hospitals, schools, and childcare facilities. Thus, high local CO concentrations are considered to have a direct influence on the receptors they affect. It should be noted that as older, more polluting vehicles are retired and replaced with newer, cleaner vehicles, the overall rate of emissions of CO for vehicle fleet throughout the State has been, and is expected to continue, decreasing. Therefore, emissions of CO would likely decrease from current levels over the lifetime of the project.

Per PCAPCD guidance, if a project will degrade an intersection in the project vicinity from an acceptable peak-hour Level of Service (LOS) (e.g., LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable peak-hour LOS (e.g., LOS E or F), or if the project will substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak-hour LOS on one or more streets or at one or more intersections in the project vicinity, then the project has the potential to cause a potential a CO intersection hotspot. Substantially worsen is defined by PCAPCD as an increase in delay by 10 seconds or

more. It should be noted that for purposes of CO analysis the threshold of significance is worse than LOS D, however for purposes of traffic analysis the City's LOS threshold for acceptable operations is LOS C. As discussed above, the proposed project would generate fewer vehicle trips than allowed for the site developed as a light industrial, office or commercial use under the existing land use and zoning designations, which in turn would lead to decreased delays at nearby intersections.

In addition to the CO emissions discussed above, Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are also a category of environmental concern. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (Handbook) provides recommendations for siting new sensitive land uses near sources typically associated with significant levels of TAC emissions, including, but not limited to, freeways and high traffic roads, distribution centers, and rail yards. CARB has identified diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC. High volume freeways/roadways, stationary diesel engines, and facilities attracting heavy and constant diesel traffic were identified as having the highest associated health risks from DPM. Health risks from TACs are a function of both the concentration of emissions and the duration of exposure. Health-related risks associated with DPM in particular are primarily associated with long-term exposure and associated risk of contracting cancer.

For freeways and roads with high traffic volumes, Table 4-1 of the CARB Handbook recommends "Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day." Any project placing sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a major roadway or freeway may have the potential to expose those receptors to DPM. The edge of the nearest travel lane of State Route 65 (SR 65) is located approximately 4,100 feet west of the site at the closest point, well beyond the CARB-recommended distance of 500 feet. Thus the project would not be subject to substantial DPM emissions associated with freeway traffic and risk levels from SR 65 would not expose new receptors to substantial health risk.

Due to the nature of the project, relatively few vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would be expected to be composed of heavy-duty diesel-fueled trucks and their associated emissions. The proposed project would not involve any land uses or operations that would be considered major sources of TACs, including DPM, and the project does not involve long-term operation of any stationary diesel engine or other on-site stationary source of TACs. As such, the proposed project would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations. Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically DPM, from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. However, construction is temporary and occurs over a relatively short duration in comparison to the operational lifetime of the proposed project, particularly so for the proposed project as the construction activities associated with the proposed project would occur over an approximately 16-month period. All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the State's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. Project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, particularly associated with permitting of air pollutant sources. In addition, construction equipment would

operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and only portions of the site would be disturbed at a time. Considering the intermittent nature of construction equipment, the duration of construction activities, and the typical long-term exposure periods typically associated with health risks, the likelihood that any one sensitive receptor would be exposed to high concentrations of DPM for any extended period of time due to project construction would be low. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not be expected to expose any nearby sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of DPM or other TACs.

A prior analysis of the potential health risk to from exposure to DPM emissions associated with the nearby UNFI facility determined that the UNFI facility would be ranked as “low” for both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic risk, which indicates that the emissions of DPM from the facility would not lead to significant cancer or non-cancer risk to future adjacent sensitive receptors. Given the low facility prioritization scores determined in the analysis, a detailed, site-specific health risk assessment is not warranted. (Raney Planning and Management, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, Stanford Ranch – Phases IV, Parcels 54, 55, 57 and 71 (West Oaks) Project, January 2013).

Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant.

e. Odors – Less Than Significant Impact. Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. Although less common, emissions of DPM from heavy-duty diesel truck traffic could result in objectionable odors. Diesel fumes from delivery trucks could be found to be objectionable. Thus, truck deliveries and idling at the adjacent UNFI facility could result in objectionable odors related to the associated diesel fumes. Such odors could create the potential for annoyance and/or discomfort to nearby non-industrial land uses. The UNFI facility is required by State law to restrict idling by delivery trucks to less than five minutes, and it must also comply with other applicable standards and regulations related to DPM emissions. Due to the State law, odors associated with the UNFI facility would not be expected to substantially affect future sensitive receptors (on-site manager) associated with the project.

In addition, PCAPCD Rule 205, Nuisance, addresses the exposure of “nuisance or annoyance” air contaminant discharges, including odors, and provides enforcement of odor control. Rule 205 is complaint-based, where if public complaints are sufficient to cause the odor source to be a public nuisance, then the PCAPCD is required to investigate the identified source as well as determine an acceptable solution for the source of the complaint, which could include operational modifications to correct the nuisance condition. Thus, although not anticipated, if odor or air quality complaints are made upon the future development under the proposed

project, the PCAPCD would be required to ensure that such complaints are addressed and mitigated, as necessary.

Because the proposed project does not include the development of odor-generating land uses or development in proximity to odor-generating land uses, and because the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of single passenger vehicles rather than heavy-duty diesel trucks, and considering the intermittent nature and short-term duration of construction activities, the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in the exposure of residences or other sensitive receptors to objectionable odors or result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project will modify habitats through the removal of native and other plant material, but the project site does not contain any oak trees. The project site has been previously graded and is subject to regular mowing for fire abatement purposes; these disturbances have diminished the ability of the project site's habitat to support special status animal and plant species. Impacts to wetlands/waters of the U.S. and to special status animal and plant species are not anticipated to occur due to their lack of presence or potential presence on the project site.

Prior Environmental Analysis

As a "program EIR" under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the biological resources of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included special-status species, species of concern, non-listed species, biological communities and migratory wildlife corridors (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.10-1 through 4.10-47). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, and include policies that encourage the protection and conservation of biological resources and require compliance with rules and regulations protecting biological resources, including the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals, policies and rules and regulations protecting biological resources, significant biological resources impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will impact sensitive biological communities, will result in the loss of native oak and heritage trees, will result in the loss of oak woodland habitat and will contribute to cumulative impacts to biological resources. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for biological resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

Because the project site has been previously mass graded, is subject to regular mowing for fire abatement purposes and is mostly surrounded by developed land uses, the proposed project site has limited biological value. As such, the project would have limited impacts on biological resources as site development occurs. It should be noted that wetlands that were previously identified within the overall Stanford Ranch General Development Plan area that were going to be impacted by the development of the master planned Stanford Ranch community were permitted for fill by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“Corps”) under permit number 9988 (signed by the Corps on March 21, 1989). The permit required the implementation of a wetlands creation plan to offset the loss of wetlands as a result of the development that was identified and planned for within the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Effect on Protected Species – Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The Stanford Ranch Storage project would have a minor impact on biological resources (largely native and exotic grasses) as site development occurs. However, as noted above, the project site has already been subject to grading and mowing and wetlands permitting. Based on a review of information contained in the Northwest Rocklin Planning Area EIR (EDAW 1985), the Stanford Ranch EIR (Jones and Stokes, 1986), the Survey of the Vernal Pools of Stanford Ranch, Rocklin California (RBR & Associates, Inc. 1988), the Stanford Ranch Addition Parcels L & J Annexation and Prezone, General Plan Amendment EIR (McClelland Consultants, 1989) and the Stanford Ranch General Plan Amendment, General Development Plan Amendment and Tentative Subdivision Map for Phases II and IV (Fugro, 1994), the project site is not known to be inhabited by any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species by any local, state, or federal agency nor does it contain oak trees, jurisdictional waters of the United States or wetlands. However, the project site may contain habitat for nesting raptors and migratory birds.

To address the potential impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-1 The applicant/developer shall attempt to time the removal of potential nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds to avoid the nesting season (February 1 – September 15).

If vegetation removal and/or project grading or construction activities occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February 1 – September 15), the applicant/developer shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of development activities. The survey shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be valid for one construction season. Documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary tree removal may proceed. If there is a break in construction activity of more than 14 days, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

If the survey results are positive (active nests are found), impacts shall be avoided by the establishment of appropriate buffers. The biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the City to determine the size of an appropriate buffer area (CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 500-foot buffers). Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist may be required if the activity has the potential to adversely affect an active nest.

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (September 16-January 31), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds to a less than significant level.

b. and c. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands – Less Than Significant Impact. As noted above, the wetlands that once occurred on the Placer Creek Corporate Center project site, which includes the Placer Creek Apartments project site, have been filled based upon a permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and there is no riparian habitat on the project site that is subject to CDFW jurisdiction. Therefore, there are less than significant impacts to wetlands and riparian habitat.

d. Fish and Wildlife Movement – Less Than Significant Impact. Wildlife corridors link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. The fragmentation of undeveloped land by urbanization creates isolated “islands” of wildlife habitat. Fragmentation can also occur when a portion of one or more habitats is converted into another habitat, such as when woodland or scrub habitat is altered or converted into grasslands after a disturbance such as fire, mudslide, or grading activities. Wildlife corridors mitigate the effects of this fragmentation by: (1) allowing animals to move between remaining habitats, thereby permitting depleted populations to be replenished and promoting genetic exchange and diversity; (2) providing escape routes from fire, predators, and human disturbances, thus reducing the risk of catastrophic events (such as fire or disease) on population or local species extinction, and (3), serving as a travel routes for individual animals as they move within their home ranges in search of food, water, mates and other needs.

The project site consists of disturbed and developed habitats and is bordered by West Stanford Ranch Road and West Oaks Boulevard. The surrounding land uses include offices to the north and west, residential and offices to the east, and light industrial to the south. The project site is located in the center of a developed area that includes roads, existing residential and non-residential developments, and current active construction. The project site is isolated from any adjacent natural habitats and there are no water bodies on the project site. As such, the project site does not link two significant natural areas and is not considered a wildlife migration corridor. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native

resident or migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites and the impact is less than significant.

e. Local Policies/Ordinances – No Impact. The City of Rocklin regulates the removal of and construction within the dripline of native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 6 inches or more at 4.5 feet above ground level under the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Oak Tree Preservation Guidelines. Seven oak species and five hybrids between these species are defined as “native oaks” by the City. Per the City’s oak tree ordinance, the diameter at breast height (DBH) of a multiple trunk tree is the measurement of the largest trunk only, and heritage trees are defined as native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 24 inches or more.

The City of Rocklin commissioned the firm of Phytosphere Research to evaluate, characterize, and make recommendations on the City’s urban forest, and from that effort, a 2006 report titled “Planning for the Future of Rocklin’s Urban Forest” was produced. One of the findings of this report was that the City’s overall tree canopy cover has increased from 11% in 1952 to 18% in 2003 (a 63% increase) due to the protection of existing oaks and growth of both new and existing trees. This finding supports the City’s on-going practice of requiring mitigation for oak tree removal through its Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance as being an effective way to maintain or even increase urban forest canopy.

There are no native oak trees within the boundaries of the project site that would be regulated by the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

There are no facts or circumstances presented by the proposed project which create conflicts with other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore there is no impact related to conflicts with local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources.

f. Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan – No Impact The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan because the site is not subject to any such plan; therefore there is no impact related to a conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan.

V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X			
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project could affect unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources or sites as development occurs.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to historical, cultural and paleontological resources within the Planning area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included potential destruction or damage to any historical, cultural, and paleontological resources (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.8-1 through 4.8-21). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Open Space, Recreation and Conservation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage the preservation and protection of historical, cultural and paleontological resources and the proper treatment and handling of such resources when they are discovered.

The General Plan EIR concluded that despite these goals and policies, significant cultural resources impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will contribute to cumulative impacts to historic character. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were

adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

Historically significant structures and sites as well as the potential for the discovery of unknown archaeological or paleontological resources as a result of development activities are discussed in the Rocklin General Plan. Policies and mitigation measures have been included in the General Plan to encourage the preservation of historically significant known and unknown areas.

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Historic Resources – No Impact. CEQA Statutes Section 21084.1 identifies historic resources as those listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, based on a range of criteria, including association with events or patterns of events that have made significant contributions to broad patterns of historical development in the United States or California, including local, regional, or specific cultural patterns (California Register Criterion 1), structures which are directly associated with important persons in the history of the state or country (Criterion 2), which embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period, or other aesthetic importance (Criterion 3), or which have the potential to reveal important information about the prehistory or history of the state or the nation (such as archaeological sites) (Criterion 4).

In addition to meeting at least one of the above criteria, the structure must typically be over 50 years old (a state guideline rather than a statutory requirement) and have retained historic integrity sufficient to be clearly evident as a historic resource through a combination of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association with historic patterns. The definition of “integrity” in this context is based on criteria established by the National Register of Historic Places.

The project site does not contain any known historic resources as defined in §15064.5 (there are no identified cultural resources on the project site that are considered eligible for the National or State Register of Historic Places/Resources); therefore no impacts to historic resources are anticipated.

b. and c. Archaeological Resources and Paleontological Resources – Less Than Significant With Mitigation. As noted above, the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered cultural resources.

Initial Study Page 34 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
---	--

To address the project’s potential impact of the discovery of unknown cultural resources, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

V.-1 If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or a tribal cultural resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources would include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts and tribal cultural resources.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City’s Environmental Services Manager shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to known and unknown/ undiscovered cultural resources to a less than significant level.

d. Human Remains – Less Than Significant With Mitigation. No evidence of human remains is known to exist at the project site. However, in the event that during construction activities, human remains of Native American origin are discovered on the site during project demolition, it would be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall under the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)

Initial Study Page 35 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
---	--

(Public Resources Code Section 5097). In addition, State law (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5) requires that the Mitigation Measure V.-1 be implemented should human remains be discovered; implementation of Mitigation Measure V.-1 will reduce impacts regarding the discovery of human remains to a less than significant level.

VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the state Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X		
iv) Landslides?			X		
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table I8-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Branches of the Foothill Fault system, which are not included on the Alquist-Priolo maps, pass through or near the City of Rocklin and could pose a seismic hazard to the area including ground shaking, seismic ground failure, and landslides. Construction of the proposed project will involve clearing and grading of the site, which could render the site susceptible to a temporary increase in erosion from the grading and construction activities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of local soils and geology on development that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included seismic hazards such as groundshaking and liquefaction, erosion, soil stability, and wastewater conflicts (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011 pages 4.6-1 through 4.6-27). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in geological impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding geologic hazards and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to geologic conditions.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to, erosion control measures in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications, the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, the City’s Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, and goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety Element requiring soils and geotechnical reports for all new development, enforcement of the building code, and limiting development of severe slopes.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for geology and soils impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City ordinances, rules and regulations.

In addition, the project would be subject to the provisions of the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on

Initial Study Page 38 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

or across the permit area; to comply with the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites.

Also, a geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified engineer, will be required with the submittal of project improvement plans. The report will provide site-specific recommendations for the construction of all features of the building foundations and structures to ensure that their design is compatible with the soils and geology of the project site.

Significance Conclusions:

a., i. and ii. Fault Rupture, Ground Shaking – *Less than Significant Impact.* The City of Rocklin is located in an area known to be subject to seismic hazards, but it is not near any designated Alquist-Priolo active earthquake faults. The Foothill Fault System has been identified in previous environmental studies as potentially posing a seismic hazard to the area; however, the Foothill Fault system is located near Folsom Lake, and not within the boundaries of the City of Rocklin. There are, however, two known and five inferred inactive faults within the City of Rocklin. Existing building code requirements are considered adequate to reduce potential seismic hazards related to the construction and operation of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

a., iii. and iv. Liquefaction, Landslides – *Less than Significant Impact.* The site does not contain significant grade differences and therefore, does not possess the slope/geological conditions that involve landslide hazards. The potential for liquefaction due to earthquakes and groundshaking is considered minimal due to the site specific characteristics that exist in Rocklin; Rocklin is located over a stable granite bedrock formation and much of the area is covered by volcanic mud (not unconsolidated soils which have liquefaction tendencies). Application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding geologic hazards, and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to geologic conditions would reduce the potential impact from liquefaction to a less than significant level.

b. Soil Erosion – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Standard erosion control measures are required of all projects, including revegetation and slope standards. The project proponent will be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications as a part of the City’s development review process. The erosion and sediment control plan are reviewed against the Placer County

Stormwater Management Manual and the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual. The erosion and sediment control plan includes the implementation of Best Management Practices/Best Available Technology (BMPs/BATs) to control construction site runoff. The project will also be required to comply with the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), and the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30). The application of standard erosion control measures to the proposed project, as well as compliance with the above noted Ordinances, would reduce potential erosion-related impacts to a less than significant level for on-site grading.

c. and d. Unstable and Expansive Soil – *Less Than Significant Impact.* A geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified engineer, will be required with the submittal of the project improvement plans. The report will be required to provide site-specific recommendations for the construction of all features of the building foundations and structures to ensure that their design is compatible with the soils and geology of the project site. Through the preparation of such a report and implementation of its recommendations as required by City policy during the development review process, impacts associated with unstable soil or geologic conditions would be reduced to a less than significant level.

e. Inadequate Soils for Disposal - *No Impact.* Sewer service is available to the project site and the proposed project will be served by public sewer. Septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be necessary; therefore there are no impacts associated with the disposal of wastewater.

VII. <u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

An individual project, even a very large project, does not in itself generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to measurably influence global climate change. Global climate change is therefore by definition a cumulative impact. A project contributes to this potential cumulative impact through its cumulative incremental contribution combined with the emissions of all other sources of greenhouse gases (GHG).

Area- and mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases would be generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project. Neither the Placer County Air Pollution Control District nor the City of Rocklin has established significance thresholds for measuring the significance of a project’s incremental contribution to global climate change. However, individual projects can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions by incorporating features that reduce vehicle emissions and maximize energy-efficiency.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included consistency with greenhouse gas reduction measure, climate change environmental effects on the City and generation of greenhouse gas emissions (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.15-1 through 4.15-25). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Circulation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and promote mixed use and infill development.

The General Plan EIR concluded that despite these goals and policies, significant greenhouse gas emission impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions which are cumulatively considerable. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to this impact, which was found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

Generation of greenhouse gas emissions as a result of development activities are discussed in the Rocklin General Plan. Policies and mitigation measures have been included in the General Plan that encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and promote mixed use and infill development.

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for greenhouse gas emissions impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Study report for the proposed project. The report, dated October 23, 2018, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, similar to a greenhouse. The accumulation of GHG emissions has been implicated as a driving force for Global Climate change. Definitions of climate change vary between and across regulatory authorities and the scientific community, but in general can be described as the changing of the earth’s climate caused by natural fluctuations and the impact of human activities that alter the composition of the global atmosphere.

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emission of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, city and virtually every individual on Earth. A project's GHG emissions are at a micro-scale relative to global emissions, but could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact

The major concern is that increases in GHG emissions are causing Global Climate Change. Global Climate Change is a change in the average weather on earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the speed of global warming and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, the vast majority of the scientific community now agrees that there is a direct link between increased GHG emissions and long term global temperature increases. Potential global warming impacts in California may include, but are not limited to, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, more drought years, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity. In California, GHGs are defined to include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃), and hydrofluorocarbons. To account for the warming potential of GHGs, GHG emissions are quantified and reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e).

An individual project, even a very large project, does not in itself generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to measurably influence global climate change. Global climate change is therefore by definition a cumulative impact. A project contributes to this potential cumulative impact through its cumulative incremental contribution combined with the emissions of all other sources of greenhouse gases (GHG). In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable" (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064 (h)(1) and 15130). To make this determination, the incremental impacts of the project must be compared to with the effects of past, current and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and probable future projects to make this determination is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

Regulatory Framework

In September 2006, then Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 delegated the authority for its implementation to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and directs CARB to enforce the statewide cap. In accordance with AB 32, CARB prepared the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) for California, which was approved in 2008. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions. Based on the reduction goals called for in the 2008 Scoping Plan, a 29 percent reduction in GHG levels relative to a Business As Usual (BAU) scenario would be required to meet 1990 levels by 2020. The BAU condition is project and site specific and varies. The BAU

scenario is based on what could or would occur on a particular site in the year 2020 without implementation of a proposed project or consideration of any State regulation emission reductions or voluntary GHG reduction measures. The CARB, per the 2008 Scoping Plan, explicitly recommends that local governments utilize a 15 percent GHG reduction below “today’s” levels by 2020 to ensure that community emissions match the State’s reduction target, where today’s levels would be considered 2010 BAU levels.

In 2011, the baseline or BAU level for the Scoping Plan was revised to account for the economic downturn and State regulation emission reductions (i.e., Pavley, Low Carbon Fuel Standard [LCFS], and Renewable Portfolio Standard [RPS]). Accordingly, the Scoping Plan emission reduction target from BAU levels required to meet 1990 levels by 2020 was modified from 29 percent to 21.7 percent where the BAU level is based on 2010 levels singularly, or 16 percent where the BAU level is based on 2010 levels and includes State regulation emission reductions noted above. The amended Scoping Plan was re-approved August 24, 2011.

The Scoping Plan must be updated every five years. The *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan Update) was approved by CARB on May 22, 2014 and builds upon the initial Scoping Plan with new strategies and recommendations. The Scoping Plan Update highlights the State’s progress towards the 2020 GHG emission reduction goals defined in the original Scoping Plan and evaluates how to align the State’s longer-term GHG reduction strategies with other State policy priorities for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation and land use. According to the Scoping Plan Update, the State is on track to meet the 2020 GHG goal and has created a framework for ongoing climate action that could be built upon to maintain and continue economic sector-specific reductions beyond 2020, on the path to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, as required by AB 32. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions and achieve the emissions reductions targets required by AB 32 and the more recent SB 32. In concert with statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, air pollution control districts throughout the State have implemented their own policies and plans to achieve emissions reductions in line with the Scoping Plan and emissions reductions targets.

On October 13, 2016 the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) adopted GHG emissions thresholds to help the district attain the GHG reduction goals established by AB 32 and SB 32. The updated thresholds specify a bright-line threshold for GHG emissions during construction activity of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr. For operational emissions, the updated thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold is judged by the PCAPCD as having a less than significant impact on GHG emissions within the District and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Projects that would result in emissions above the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold would not necessarily result in substantial impacts, if certain efficiency thresholds are met. The efficiency thresholds, which are based on service populations and square footage, are presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table below.

PCAPCD GHG OPERATIONAL THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
Efficiency Thresholds			
Residential (MT CO ₂ e/capita)		Non-Residential (MT CO ₂ e/1,000 sf)	
Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
<i>Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy. Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA October 13, 2016.</i>			

Projects that fall below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or meet the efficiency thresholds are considered to be in keeping with statewide GHG emissions reduction targets, which would ensure that the proposed project would not inhibit the State’s achievement of GHG emissions reductions. Thus, projects which involve emissions below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or below the efficiency thresholds presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table above are considered to result in less-than-significant impacts in regards GHG emissions within the District and would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Finally, the PCAPCD has also established a Bright Line Cap, which shall be the maximum limit for any proposed project. The Bright Line Cap is 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr for all types of projects.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b.) Generate Greenhouse Gas and Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. Because the proposed project involves increased vehicle use in the area, the GHG emissions related to increased vehicle use in the area must be analyzed. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MT CO₂e), based on the global warming potential of the individual pollutants.

Short-term emissions of GHG associated with construction of the proposed project are estimated at the highest to be 416.52 MT CO₂e/year, which is below the 10,000 MT CO₂e/year threshold. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change. Due to the size of the proposed project, the project’s estimated construction-related GHG contribution to global climate change would be considered negligible on the overall global emissions scale.

The long-term operational GHG emissions estimate for the proposed project incorporates the project’s potential area source and vehicle emissions, emissions associated with utility and water usage, and the generation of wastewater and solid waste. The annual GHG emissions

associated with the proposed project would be 451.69 MTCO₂e/year, which is below the 1,100 CO₂e/year threshold of significance.

Because the levels of short-term and long-term emissions are below the 1,100 MTCO₂e/year significance thresholds, the proposed project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target nor conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation related to GHG reduction and the impact of the proposed project on global climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would be considered less than significant.

VIII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.			X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Construction and operation of a self-storage facility is not anticipated to involve the transportation, use and disposal of large amounts of hazardous materials. Construction activities would involve the transportation, use and disposal of small amounts of hazardous materials.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated human health and hazards impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included wildland fire hazards, transportation, use and disposal of hazardous materials, and emergency response and evacuation plans (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011 pages 4.7-1 through 4.7-30). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the Rocklin General Plan can introduce a variety of human health and hazards impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of development standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding hazardous conditions, and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to hazards and hazardous materials.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to, Chapter 2.32 of the Rocklin Municipal Code which requires the preparation and maintenance of an emergency operations plan, preventative measures in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications, compliance with local, state and federal standards related to hazards and hazardous materials and goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety and Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Elements requiring coordination with emergency management agencies, annexation into fee districts for fire prevention/suppression and medical response, incorporation of fuel modification/fire hazard reduction planning, and requirements for site-specific hazard investigations and risk analysis.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for human health and hazards impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan and the City’s Improvement Standards, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

In addition, Chapter 2.32 of the Rocklin Municipal Code requires the development of emergency procedures in the City through the Emergency Operations Plan. The Emergency

Initial Study Page 48 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

Operations Plan provides a framework to guide the City's efforts to mitigate and prepare for, respond to, and recover from major emergencies or disasters. To implement the Emergency Operations Plan, the City has established a Disaster Council, which is responsible for reviewing and recommending emergency operations plans for adoption by the City Council. The Disaster Council plans for the protection of persons and property in the event of fires, floods, storms, epidemic, riot, earthquake and other disasters.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials, Release of Hazardous Materials – *Less than Significant Impact.* Construction, operation and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials, including fuels (gasoline and diesel), oils and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps and detergents), and fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and yard/landscaping equipment. While these products noted above may contain known hazardous materials, the volume of material would not create a significant hazard to the public through routine transport, use, or disposal and would not result in a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident condition involving the release of hazardous materials. Compliance with various Federal, State, and local laws and regulations (including but not limited to Titles 8 and 22 of the Code of California Regulations, Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code) addressing hazardous materials management and environmental protection would be required to ensure that there is not a significant hazardous materials impact associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed project.

c. Hazardous Emissions Near Schools – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The Knowledge Tree Academy on Sunset Boulevard is within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of the project site, located approximately 650 feet away. The closest schools not within one-quarter mile for the project site are The Goddard School which is approximately 1,600 feet away, Maria Montessori Academy on Wildcat Boulevard which is approximately 1,800 feet away and William Jessup University on University Avenue which is approximately 2,370 feet away. Although self-storage projects of this nature would not typically emit any significant amounts of hazardous materials, substances, or waste or be involved in the transportation of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, there are existing rules and regulations, as indicated above, that address hazardous materials management and environmental protection. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact related to hazardous emissions or hazardous materials within one quarter mile of a school.

d. Hazardous Site List – *No Impact.* The project site is not on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Government Code 65962.5 is known as the Cortese List. The Cortese database identifies public drinking water wells with detectable levels of contamination, hazardous substance sites selected for remedial action, sites with known toxic material identified through the abandoned site assessment program, sites with Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) having a reportable release and all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is known migration. The Department of Toxic Substances

Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database were searched on January 14, 2019 and no open hazardous sites were identified on the project site; therefore there is no impact related to a hazardous materials site on the project site.

e. and f. Public Airport Hazards and Private Airport Hazards – *No Impact.* The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore there is no public or private airport hazard impact.

g. Emergency Response Plan – *Less than Significant Impact.* The City’s existing street system, particularly arterial and collector streets, function as emergency evacuation routes. The project’s design and layout will not impair or physically interfere with the street system emergency evacuation route or impede an emergency evacuation plan; therefore a less than significant impact on emergency routes/plans would be anticipated.

h. Wildland Fires – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is an infill site located in a mostly developed business professional, light industrial and commercial area and is surrounded by office, light industrial, commercial and residential development with some recreation/conservation land uses to the south side of West Oaks Boulevard. Additionally, the proposed project has been reviewed by the Rocklin Fire Department and has been designed with adequate emergency access for use by the Rocklin Fire Department to reduce the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires to a less than significant level.

IX. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X		
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X		

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (cont'd.) Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X		
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project would involve grading activities that would remove vegetation and expose soil to wind and water erosion and potentially impact water quality. Waterways in the Rocklin area have the potential to flood and expose people or structures to flooding. Additional impervious surfaces would be created with the development of the proposed project.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated hydrology and water quality impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included water quality, ground water quality and supply, drainage, flooding, risks of seiche, tsunami and mudflow (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.9-1 through 4.9-37). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in hydrology and water quality impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies related to hydrology, flooding and water quality, and compliance with local, state, and federal water quality standards and floodplain development requirements.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to, flood prevention and drainage requirements in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications, the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, the State Water Resources Control Board General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit requirements, and goals and policies in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation and Safety Elements requiring the protection of new and existing development from flood and drainage hazards, the prevention of storm drainage run-off in excess of pre-development levels, the development and application of erosion control plans and best management practices, the annexation of new development into existing drainage

maintenance districts where warranted, and consultation with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and other appropriate entities.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as well as relevant standards from the City’s Improvement Standards for hydrology and water quality impacts will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

The proposed project would be subject to the provisions of the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on or across the permit area; to comply with the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites. Chapter 8.30 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, prohibits the discharge of any materials or pollutants that cause or contribute to a violation of applicable water quality standards, other than stormwater, into the municipal storm drain system or watercourse. Discharges from specified activities that do not cause or contribute to the violation of plan standards, such as landscape irrigation, lawn watering, and flows from fire suppression activities, are exempt from this prohibition.

The project would also be subject to the City’s Flood Hazard Area Ordinance and City General Plan policies related to floodplain protection and encroachment; these tools are designed to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions by having legally enforceable regulations that are applied uniformly throughout the City to all publicly and privately owned land within flood prone or flood related erosion areas, they allow the City to protect regulatory floodplains from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants, and they ensure that regulatory floodplains, based on the most current information, are not adversely affected by new development, both upstream and downstream.

In addition, the project would be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications that are a part of the City’s development review process.

Significance Conclusions:

a., c., d., e. and f. Water Quality Standards and Drainage – *Less than Significant Impact.* Storm water runoff from the project site will be collected in stormwater drainage pipes and then directed through water quality treatment devices/areas as Best Management Practices (BMP) and/or Low Impact Development (LID) features and then into the City’s storm drain system. The purpose of the BMP/LID features is to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system. The City’s storm drain system maintains the necessary capacity to support development on the proposed project site. Therefore, violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are not anticipated.

To address the potential for polluted water runoff during project construction, the project would be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications as a part of the City’s development review process. The erosion and sediment control plan are reviewed against the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual and the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual. The erosion and sediment control plan includes the implementation of Best Management Practices/Best Available Technology (BMPs/BATs) to control construction site runoff. The project will also be required to comply with the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), and the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30), which includes the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or a river.

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because the City’s policies of requiring new developments to detain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels (unless the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District’s Flood Control Manual requires otherwise) and to coordinate with other projects’ master plans to ensure no adverse cumulative effects will be applied. Whether the project is located within the Dry Creek watershed or the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, the City’s application of conditions of approval requiring a registered civil engineer to prepare a final drainage plan and study consistent with the City’s policies will ensure that development will not increase stormwater runoff rates beyond pre-development levels. Per the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan, onsite stormwater detention is generally not recommended anywhere in the Dry Creek watershed because it has been determined that on-site detention would be detrimental to the overall watershed, unless existing downstream drainage facilities cannot handle post-construction runoff from the project site. Substantial erosion, siltation or flooding, on- or off-site, and exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems would not be anticipated to occur.

Therefore, impacts related to water quality, water quality standards and drainage would be less than significant.

Initial Study Page 54 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

b. Groundwater Supplies – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project will use domestic water from the Placer County Water Agency and not use wells or groundwater; therefore existing groundwater resources will not be depleted. The project site itself is not a substantial recharge area because of its smaller size and distance from creeks and drainages. The City’s policies of requiring new developments to retain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels and implementation of Low Impact Development features will ensure that groundwater recharge rates are also maintained at pre-development levels. Therefore, there is a less than significant groundwater supply impact.

g., h., i. and j. Flooding, Inundation by Tsunami, Seiche, or Mudflow – *Less Than Significant Impact.* According to FEMA flood maps (Map Panel 06061C0933H and 06061C0934H, effective date November 2, 2018) the developable portion of the project site is located in flood zone X, Area of Minimal Flood Hazard which indicates that the project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and outside of the 500-year flood hazard area. The project site is not located within the potential inundation area of any dam or levee failure, nor is the project site located sufficiently near any significant bodies of water or steep hillsides to be at risk from inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore the proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death as a result of flooding nor will the project be subject to inundation by tsunami, seiche or mudflow and a less than significant impact would be anticipated.

X. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Approval of the project would allow the construction and operation of a new self-storage facility totaling approximately 93,459 +/- square feet (storage facility and manager’s office/residence) and associated parking and landscaping on a 9.8 +/- acre site. The project site is designated Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) and Planned Development Light Industrial (PD-LI). The project requires Design Review and Conditional Use Permit entitlements to allow for a self-storage facility project such as the one being proposed. As discussed below, land use impacts are not anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on land use as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included dividing an established community and potential conflicts with established land uses within and adjacent to the City (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.1-1 through 4.1-38). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in land use impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding land use impacts.

These goals and policies include, but are not limited to goals and policies in the General Plan Land Use Element requiring buffering of land uses, reviewing development proposals for compatibility issues, establishing and maintaining development standards and encouraging communication between adjacent jurisdictions.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to land use incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Division of Community – *No Impact.* The proposed project site is currently vacant and the entire project is within the City of Rocklin. The proposed project would construct a new self-storage facility totaling approximately 93,459 +/- square feet (storage facility and manager’s office/residence) and associated parking and landscaping, which would not physically divide an established community. Therefore there is no division of community impact.

b. Plan Conflict – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is designated Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned and Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) and Planned Development Light Industrial (PD-LI). The project requires approval of Design Review and Conditional Use Permit entitlements to allow for the self-storage project as is being proposed. The proposed project is consistent with the site’s land use and zoning designations and upon approval of the project entitlements noted above, the development of the project would not conflict with land use designations and would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with land use plans, policies or regulations.

c. Habitat Plan Conflict - *No Impact.* There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans which apply to the project site, and there would be no impact on such plans.

XI. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?					X

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, no impact is anticipated because the project site does not contain known mineral resources.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Mineral Resources – No Impact. The Rocklin General Plan and associated EIR analyzed the potential for “productive resources” such as, but not limited to, granite and gravel (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.6-4 through 4.6-5 and 4.6-17). The City of Rocklin planning area has no mineral resources as classified by the State Geologist. The Planning Area has no known or suspected mineral resources that would be of value to the region and to residents of the state. The project site is not delineated in the Rocklin General Plan or any other plans as a mineral resource recovery site. Mineral resources of the project site have not changed with the passage of time since the General Plan EIR was adopted. Based on this discussion, the project is not anticipated to have a mineral resources impact.

XII. <u>NOISE</u> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, development of the proposed project will result in an increase in short-term noise impacts from construction activities. Compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies, and the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines would reduce construction noise related impacts to a less than significant level. As also discussed below, development of the proposed project would result in an exposure of the on-site manager to traffic noise levels in excess of City noise level standards,

and mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of noise associated with the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included construction noise, traffic noise, operational noise, groundborne vibration, and overall increased in noise resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.5-1 through 4.5-48).

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Noise Element, which includes policies that require acoustical analyses to determine noise compatibility between land uses, application of stationary and mobile noise source sound limits/design standards, restriction of development of noise-sensitive land uses unless effective noise mitigations are incorporated into projects, and mitigation of noise levels to ensure that the noise level design standards of the Noise Element are not exceeded.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals and policies, significant noise impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards, will result in exposure to surface transportation noise sources and stationary noise sources in excess of applicable noise standards and will contribute to cumulative transportation noise impacts within the Planning Area. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts associated with noise incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc., a Sacramento-area consulting firm with recognized expertise in noise, prepared an environmental noise assessment of the Stanford Ranch Storage project. Their report, dated March 30, 2018, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has

Initial Study Page 60 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

Background Information on Noise

Noise is a subjective reaction to different types of sounds. Noise is typically defined as (airborne) sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected or undesired, and may therefore be classified as a more specific group of sounds. Perceptions of sounds and noise are highly subjective from person to person. The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environmental noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by A-weighted sound levels. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as dBA) and the way the human ear perceives sound and for this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment.

Measuring sound directly would require a very large and awkward range of numbers, so to avoid this, the decibel (dB) scale was devised. The decibel scale is logarithmic, not linear. In other words, two sound levels 10 dB apart differ in acoustic energy by a factor of 10. When the standard logarithmic scale is A-weighted, an increase of 10 dBA is generally perceived as a doubling in loudness. For example, a 70 dBA sound is half as loud as an 80 dBA sound, and twice as loud as a 60 dBA sound.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the ambient noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given environment. A common statistical tool is the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq). The Leq is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor, Ldn, and shows very good correlation with community response to noise. The day/night average level (Ldn) is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10 dB weighting applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because Ldn represents a 24-hour average, it tends to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment.

The City of Rocklin General Plan includes criteria for stationary (non-transportation) and transportation noise sources. Because the proposed project is located within close proximity to West Stanford Ranch Road and Sunset Boulevard, this analysis focuses on whether roadway noise levels would exceed City of Rocklin exterior or interior noise level standards at the manager's residence of the project. For transportation noise sources, the maximum allowable exterior noise level standard for outdoor activity areas is 60 dB Ldn and the maximum allowable interior noise level standard is 45 dB Ldn.

Noise Sources

The noise source concerns for this project are associated with the adjacent roadways, West Stanford Ranch Road and Sunset Boulevard. Noise impacts associated with these noise sources were evaluated and compared to noise level performance criteria for transportation noise sources contained within the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element.

Traffic Noise

To determine traffic noise levels on the project site, Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. conducted long-term (24-hour) noise level measurements at the project site. Existing ambient day-night average noise levels at the measurement site were measured at 71 dB Ldn. Cumulative traffic volume data from the City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR was used to predict future traffic noise levels on the project site; the predicted future Ldn noise level at the exterior façade of the manager’s residence is estimated to be 72 dB.

While the building facade is predicted to be exposed to exterior noise levels above 60 dB, the City’s 60 dB Ldn exterior noise standard is not exceeded because no residential back yard outdoor activity occurs at this location. Therefore, no exterior traffic noise reduction measures would be required.

Interior Traffic Noise Levels

The predicted future Ldn at the exterior facade of the manager’s residence is estimated to be 72 dB Ldn. Given a future exterior noise level of 72 dB Ldn, a building facade noise reduction of 27 dB would be required to achieve the interior noise level standard of 45 dB Ldn.

Standard residential construction consistent with the Uniform Building Code results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of at least 25 dB with windows closed and approximately 15 dB with windows open. Therefore, standard construction would be unacceptable for the exterior façade of the manager’s residence located nearest to Stanford Ranch Road and acoustic upgrades would be required. Specifically, all exterior windows of the manager’s residence from which the roadway would be visible should be upgraded to STC 32. In addition, air conditioning should be provided to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired for additional acoustical isolation.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b., c., and d. Exposure to Noise, Increase in Noise – *Less than Significant with Mitigation.*
The primary goal for the City of Rocklin General Plan with respect to noise is: “To protect City residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise”. To implement that goal, the City has adopted Noise Compatibility Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Noise Control. The objective of the Noise Compatibility Guidelines is to assure that

consideration is given to the sensitivity to noise of a proposed land use in relation to the noise environment in which it is proposed to be located.

Potential noise impacts can be categorized into short-term construction noise impacts and long-term or permanent noise impacts. The City has adopted standard conditions for project approvals which address short-term impacts. These include limiting traffic speeds to 25 mph and keeping equipment in clean and tuned condition. The proposed project would be subject to these standard conditions. The proposed project would also be subject to the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines, including restricting construction-related noise generating activities within or near residential areas to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends to the satisfaction of the City Engineer or Building Official. Therefore, impacts associated with increases in the ambient noise environment during construction would be less than significant.

As noted above in the Project-Level Environmental Analysis discussion, there are no outdoor activity areas in the proposed project and therefore no outdoor activity areas would exceed the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior standard. However, the exterior façade of the manager’s unit is predicted to be exposed to traffic noise levels of 72 dB Ldn, which would result in interior noise levels in excess of the 45 dB Ldn standard. Therefore, interior noise control measures will be required for the manager’s residence.

To address the project’s potential traffic noise impacts to the manager’s residence, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

XII.-1 All windows of the manager’s residence from which West Stanford Ranch Road would be visible shall be upgraded to windows with an STC rating of 32.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce traffic noise impacts to the manger’s residence to a less than significant level.

e. and f. Public and Private Airport Noise – No Impact. The City of Rocklin, including the project site, is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport, and is therefore not subject to obtrusive aircraft noise related to airport operations. Therefore, there is no airport related noise impact.

XIII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure.)			X		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project will result in the development and operation of a 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility with a manager’s office/residence, which will provide a small amount of employment opportunities. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth or displace substantial numbers of people.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the biological resources of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included special-status species, species of concern, non-listed species, biological communities and migratory wildlife corridors (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.10-1 through 4.10-47). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, and include policies that encourage the protection and conservation of biological resources and require compliance with rules and regulations protecting biological resources, including the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Population Growth – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is currently designated on the City’s General Plan land use map as Business Professional/ Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) and the project does not propose to change this designation. The project site is currently zoned as Planned Development- Business Professional/ Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/COMM/LI) and Planned Development- Light Industrial (PD-LI) and the project does not propose to change this designation. The addition of a self-storage facility and an office with a manager’s unit is not considered to induce substantial population growth into a City that is projected to have approximately 29,283 dwelling units at the buildout of the General Plan. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant population growth impact.

b. and c. Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is currently vacant. The project includes the construction of self-storage facility and an office with a manager’s unit, which represents a net increase in housing by one unit, but the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere will not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

XIV. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
1. Fire protection?			X		
2. Police protection?			X		
3. Schools?			X		
4. Other public facilities?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impact:

The proposed project would create a need for the provision of new and/or expanded public services or facilities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for fire and police protection and school and recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for fire, police and school services, provision of adequate fire flow, and increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-1 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in public services and facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with state and local standards related to the provision of public services and facilities and through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to public services and facilities.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to the California Fire Code, the California Health and Safety Code, Chapters 8.12 and 8.20 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, and goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety and Public Services and Facilities Elements requiring studies of infrastructure and public facility needs, proportional share participation in the financial costs of public services and facilities, coordination of private development projects with public facilities and services needed to serve the project, maintaining inter-jurisdictional cooperation and coordination and requiring certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special needs to mitigate the demands/needs.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to public services incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for the project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

The project would also be subject to the California Fire Code, the California Health and Safety Code, Chapters 8.12 and 8.20 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, and the goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety, and Public Services and Facilities Elements requiring studies of infrastructure and public facility needs, proportional share participation in the financial costs of public services and facilities, coordination of private development project with public facilities and services needed to serve the project, maintaining inter-jurisdictional cooperation and coordination, and requiring certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special need to mitigate the demands/needs.

Significance Conclusions:

a., 1. Fire Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, equipping and location of fire stations within the City of Rocklin; the closest fire station to the project site is Fire Station #25 (aka #3) on Wildcat Boulevard, which is approximately 0.4 road miles away. Development of the proposed project could increase the need for fire protection services. The City collects construction taxes for use in acquiring capital facilities such as fire suppression equipment. Operation and maintenance funding for fire suppression is provided through financing districts and from general fund sources. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure fire protection service to the site and reduce fire protection impacts to less than significant.

a., 2. Police Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and equipping of the police station within the City of Rocklin. Development of the proposed project could increase the need for police patrol and

Initial Study Page 67 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
---	--

police services to the site. Funding for police services is primarily from the general fund, and is provided for as part of the City’s budget process. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure police protection services to the site and reduce police protection impacts to less than significant.

a., 3. and 4. Schools and Other Public Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project will be required to pay applicable school impact fees in effect at the time of building permit issuance to finance school facilities. The assessment of developer fees is regulated through the State Government Code. Proposition 1A/Senate Bill 50 (SB50, Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) which establishes the base amount that developers can be assessed per square foot of residential and non-residential development. If a district meets certain standards, the base adjustment can be adjusted upward a certain amount. Under SB 50, payment of the identified fees by a developer is deemed to be “full and complete mitigation” of impacts on schools resulting from new development. Participation in these funding mechanisms, as applicable, will reduce school impacts to a less than significant level as a matter of state law. The need for other public facilities would not be created by this project and the impact is anticipated to be less than significant.

XV. <u>RECREATION</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X		
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project, the development and operation of a 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility with a manager’s office/residence, would not be anticipated to increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities in a way that results in a significant impact.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-30 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in recreation facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to recreation facilities. The General Plan has established a parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 population, and has adopted goals and policies to insure that this standard is met. These goals and policies call for the provision of new park and recreational facilities as needed by new development through parkland dedication and the payment of park and recreation fees. These programs and practices are recognized in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, which mitigates these impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to recreation incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Increase Park Usage and Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project, a storage facility with a manager’s office/residence, is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities. The City of Rocklin provides parkland dedication and/or collection of park fees to mitigate for the increased recreational impacts of new residential developments at the time that a parcel or subdivision map is recorded. The resident of the proposed project would likely utilize City recreational facilities but the use is anticipated to be minimal and is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of existing facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor is the minimal use anticipated to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Any impact on City recreational facilities would be mitigated by the requirement that the project pay standard Park Development fees and annex into the appropriate maintenance districts. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts regarding the increase in use of recreational facilities.

XVI. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit)?			X		
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, the proposed project is anticipated to cause increases in traffic because an undeveloped site will become developed, but not to a degree that would significantly affect level of service (LOS) standards. Parking capacity is not anticipated to be an issue with the proposed project.

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on transportation that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included signalized intersections in Rocklin, Loomis, Roseville, Lincoln and Placer County, state/interstate highway segments and intersections, transit service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and conflicts with at-grade railways (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.4-1 through 4.4-98).

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Circulation Element, and include policies that require the monitoring of traffic on City streets to determine improvements needed to maintain an acceptable level of service, updating the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and traffic impact fees, providing for inflationary adjustments to the City’s traffic impact fees, maintaining a minimum level of service (LOS) of “C” for all signalized intersections during the PM peak period on an average weekday, maintaining street design standards, and interconnecting traffic signals and consideration of the use of roundabouts where financially feasible and warranted to provide flexibility in controlling traffic movements at intersections.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals and policies, significant transportation impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will result in increased traffic volumes at state/interstate highway intersections and impacts to state/interstate highway segments. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on utility and service systems incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for the project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Initial Study Page 71 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

Because development of the project site has been assumed in previous city-wide traffic analyses such as the General Plan Update (2011), the table and discussion below evaluate the relative impact of the proposed project based on the difference in the site’s potential and actual daily trip generation. The project site was designated as a Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use when the General Plan Update traffic analysis was completed.

Daily Trip Generation

An estimate of the proposed project’s daily trip generation has been made based on applicable trip generation rates derived from the City of Rocklin traffic model and the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (9th edition). This estimate can be compared to an estimate of the project site’s daily trip generation based on assumptions ranging from light industrial development to a more intense use such as commercial that could be developed on the project site if it were maximized and built out per the General Plan land use designation of Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial and zoning designation of Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial which existed at the time the traffic analysis for the General Plan Update was completed.

The vehicle trips generated by the proposed self-storage facility project would be less than the number of trips that could be generated if the project site was developed per the existing Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use and zoning designations (that existed at the time that the analysis for the 2011 General Plan Environmental Impact Report was conducted). Based on trip generation rates from the Rocklin Traffic Model and the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (9th edition), the proposed self-storage facility project would generate 233 daily trips (93,459 square feet X 2.5 daily trips/1000 gross square feet). Conversely, development of the same 9.8 acres per the existing Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial designation would conservatively be expected to generate between 1,135 daily trips (9.8 acres X 43,560 sf/acre = 426,888 sf X 0.35 floor-to-area ratio=149,410 X 7.6 trips/1000 sf for a Light Industrial use) to 3,735 daily trips if the site were developed with a commercial use (9.8 acres x 43,560 sf/acre = 426,888 X 0.25 floor-to-area ratio = 106,722 X 35 trips/1000 sf for Commercial). Thus, the proposed project would generate 899 to 3,502 fewer daily trips on local roads and the project would result in overall fewer emissions as compared to the emission that would be generated by a light industrial project allowed by the Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial land use and zoning designations.

TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON		
Description	Quantity	Daily Trips
Self-Storage Facility	93,459 sf	233
Light Industrial Use	149,410 sf	1,135
Commercial Use	106,722 sf	3,735
Net Difference (Light Industrial Use and Commercial Use vs. Self-Storage Facility)		- 899 to – 3,502

Significance Conclusions:

α. Conflict with Performance of Circulation System – Less than Significant Impact. As evidenced by the trip generation comparison presented above and given the project’s anticipated reduction in demand for traffic capacity, capacity or level of service impacts from the proposed project are not anticipated. Because the above analysis has verified that the proposed project will not result in any significant traffic impacts more severe than those disclosed in the General Plan EIR, the City finds pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (C) (4), that these cumulative “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR.”

Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) is a transportation performance metric that is used as an input to air quality and noise analyses. VMT not only addresses the number of trips generated by a given land use, but also the length of those trips. By doing so, the placement of a given land use in proximity to complementary land uses, and available transit, walking and bicycling facilities are all considered. VMT can also be used to quantify the effects of proposed changes to a roadway network, transportation demand strategies, and investments in non-auto travel modes. VMT may be expressed in absolute numbers of as “per capita” rations, such as VMT per person, household, dwelling unit, employee, or service population (persons plus employees).

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which was signed by Governor Brown on September 27, 2013, created a process to change the way transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA. Based upon direction provided in SB 743, on November 27, 2017 the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research transmitted to the California Natural Resources Agency its proposal for comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines, including proposed updates related to analyzing transportation impacts pursuant to SB 743. Until such time that the Natural Resources Agency completes its formal administrative rulemaking process and the Office of Administrative Law reviews and approves any changes to the CEQA Guidelines, the use of VMT in CEQA documents for analyzing transportation impacts is not required. However, for information purposes, the Stanford Ranch Storage project is projected to generate approximately 1,390 average daily VMT under cumulative conditions.

The project will be conditioned to contribute its fair share to the cost of circulation improvements via the existing citywide traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fee program that would

be applied as a uniformly applied development policy and standard. The traffic impact mitigation fee program is one of the various methods that the City of Rocklin uses for financing improvements identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP, which is overseen by the City's Public Services Department, is updated periodically to respond to changing conditions and to assure that growth in the City and surrounding jurisdictions does not degrade the level of service on the City's roadways. The roadway improvements that are identified in the CIP in response to anticipated growth in population and development in the City are consistent with the City's Circulation Element. The traffic impact fee program collects funds from new development in the City to finance a portion of the roadway improvements that result from traffic generated by the new development. Fees are calculated on a citywide basis, differentiated by type of development in relationship to their relative traffic impacts. The intent of the fee is to provide an equitable means of ensuring that future development contributes their fair share of roadway improvements, so that the City's General Plan Circulation policies and quality of life can be maintained.

South Placer Regional Transportation Authority

The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) was formed through the establishment of a joint powers authority including the cities of Rocklin, Roseville and Lincoln, Placer County and the Placer County Transportation and Planning Agency in January 2002. SPRTA was formed for the implementation of fees to fund specialized regional transportation projects including planning, design, administration, environmental compliance, and construction costs. Regional transportation projects included in the SPRTA include Douglas Boulevard/Interstate 80 Interchange, Placer Parkway, Lincoln Bypass, Sierra College Boulevard Widening, State Route 65 Widening, Rocklin Road/Interstate 80 Interchange, Auburn Folsom Boulevard Widening, and Transit Projects. Similar to other members of SPRTA, the City of Rocklin has adopted a SPRTA fee for all development, and the proposed project would be subject to payment of such a fee.

Highway 65 Interchange Improvement Fee

The cities of Rocklin and Roseville and Placer County have established the "Bizz Johnson" Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority that has adopted an interchange traffic fee on all new development within Rocklin, Roseville and affected portions of Placer County. The purpose of the fee is to finance four interchanges on State Route 65 to reduce the impact of increased traffic from local development; the proposed project would be subject to payment of such a fee.

The development of the proposed project and the resulting addition of a 93,459 +/-square foot self-storage facility with a manager's office/residence would not result in project-specific significant effects as demonstrated by the trip generation comparison that is presented above.

b. Conflict with Congestion Management Program – No Impact. The City of Rocklin does not have an applicable congestion management program that has been established by a county

Initial Study Page 74 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
---	--

congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; therefore there is no conflict with an applicable congestion management program impact.

c. Air Traffic Levels – No Impact. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any impacts on air traffic because it is not located near an airport or within a flight path. In addition, the proposed project will not result in a change in location of planned development that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is no change in air traffic patterns impact.

d. and e. Hazards and Emergency Access – Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is evaluated by the City’s Engineering Services Manager to assess such items as hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. In addition, the proposed project is evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin’s Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant hazard or emergency access impact.

f. Alternative Modes of Transportation – Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Rocklin seeks to promote the use of public transit through development conditions requiring park-and-ride lots, and bus turnouts. Bike lanes are typically required along arterial and collector streets. There are existing Class II bike lanes along West Stanford Ranch Road, Sunset Boulevard and West Oaks Boulevard in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project does not conflict with any bike lane locations or with other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation.

Transit service in the project vicinity is provided by Placer County Transit (PCT). The bus route closest to the project site is the Lincoln/Rocklin/Sierra College which runs a continuous route between Lincoln and Sierra College, with stops nearest the project site being at Sunset Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road and Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard. The project does not conflict with these bus route or stop locations or other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation.

The project, a self-storage facility with a manager’s office/residence, does not create a high demand for off-street parking. Customers of the self-storage facility will make trips to and from their specific storage units and will typically not need a parking space as a part of their trips. It is anticipated that the only off-street parking that would be necessary for the proposed project will be for the on-site manager and the occasional visitor to the self-storage facility who comes to the site to inquire about storage opportunities/availabilities. The proposed project is providing a total of 6 off-street parking spaces, composed of five standard stalls and one handicap stall, for general use which is considered to be an adequate supply of parking for facilities of this type based upon the City’s experience with existing self-storage facilities elsewhere in the City.

The proposed project is evaluated by City staff to assess potential conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and whether proposed projects would decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant alternative modes of transportation impact.

XVII. <u>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X		
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION

Project Impacts:

The project site does not contain any resources that are listed with the California Register of Historical Resources or that have been determined by the lead agency to have significance to a California Native American Tribe. Therefore no impacts to tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to historical, cultural and paleontological resources within the Planning area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included potential destruction or damage to any historical, cultural, and paleontological resources (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.8-1 through 4.8-21). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Open Space, Recreation and Conservation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage the preservation and protection of historical, cultural and paleontological resources and the proper treatment and handling of such resources when they are discovered.

The General Plan EIR concluded that despite these goals and policies, significant cultural resources impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will contribute to cumulative impacts to historic character. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

Historically significant structures and sites as well as the potential for the discovery of unknown archaeological or paleontological resources as a result of development activities are discussed in the Rocklin General Plan. Policies and mitigation measures have been included in the General Plan to encourage the preservation of historically significant known and unknown areas.

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Tribal Cultural Resources –*Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation.* Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52, Gatto 2014), as of July 1, 2015 Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3 require public agencies to consult with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American tribes for the purpose of mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources; that consultation process is described in part below:

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal

Initial Study Page 77 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
---	--

notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section (Public Resources Code Section 21080.1 (d))

As of the writing of this document, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), the Lone Band of Miwok Indians (IBMI) and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (TMDCI) are the only tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area that have requested notification. Consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 (d) and per AB-52, the City of Rocklin provided formal notification of the Stanford Ranch Storage project and the opportunity to consult on it to the designated contacts of the UAIC, IBMI and TMDCI in a letter received by those organizations on April, 30, 2018. The UAIC, IBMI and TMDCI had 30 days to request consultation on the project pursuant to AB-52 and the IBMI and TMDCI did not respond prior to May 30, 2018, the end of the 30-day period. The UAIC contacted the City via e-mail on May 15, 2018 with questions about the project and requests for the handling of potential resources found on the project site and requested AB-52 consultation, and the City of Rocklin responded to the questions, provided a link to the project description and asked how the UAIC would like to proceed with consultation on May 16, 2018. The UAIC did not respond to the email and the City reached out on June 20, 2018 to see if how the UAIC would like to proceed with AB-52 consultation. The UAIC responded on June 25, 2018 with some recommended mitigation measures, to which the City responded on June 26, 2018 indicating that absent any known specific issue or concern about the project site, it is the City's intent to apply the City's standard cultural resources mitigation measure; the UAIC did not further respond. As such, the City of Rocklin has complied with AB-52 and may proceed with the CEQA process for this project per PRC Section 21082.3 (d) (1) and (3). Given that the IBMI and TMDCI did not submit a formal request for consultation on the proposed project within the required 30 day period, the City corresponded with the UAIC on its intended mitigation approach and the UAIC did not respond further, and that no other tribes have submitted a formal request to receive notification from the City of Rocklin pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. Therefore, the project's impact on tribal cultural resources is considered less than significant.

XVII. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		
b) 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?				X	
c) 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?				X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X		
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X		
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed development and operation of a 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility with a manager’s office/residence will increase the need for utility and service systems, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the utility and service providers to adequately provide such services.

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on utilities and service systems that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased generation of wastewater flow, provision of adequate wastewater treatment, increased demand for solid waste disposal, and increased demand for energy and communication services (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-34). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in utilities and service system impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to utilities and service systems.

These goals and policies include, but are not limited to, requiring studies of infrastructure needs, proportional share participation in the financial costs of public services and facilities, coordination of private development projects with public facilities and services needed to serve the project and encouraging energy conservation in new developments.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on utility and service systems incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b. and e. Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements, Exceed Wastewater Treatment Facility, Wastewater Capacity– *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is located within the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) service area for sewer. SPMUD has provided a letter regarding the proposed project indicating that the project is within their service area and eligible for service, provided that their condition requirements and standard specifications are met. SPMUD has a System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan,

which is periodically updated, to provide sewer to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary. SPMUD collects participation fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities. The proposed project is responsible for complying with all requirements of SPMUD, including compliance with wastewater treatment standards established by the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board. The South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) was created by the City of Roseville, Placer County and SPMUD to provide regional wastewater and recycled water facilities in southwestern Placer County. The regional facilities overseen by the SPWA include the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants, both of which receive flows from SPMUD (and likewise from Rocklin). To project future regional wastewater needs, the SPWA prepared the South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Evaluation) in June 2007. The Evaluation indicates that as of June 2004, flows to both the wastewater treatment plants were below design flows. Both wastewater treatment plants are permitted discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Specifically, the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is permitted to discharge an average dry weather flow not to exceed 18 mgd, while the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant is permitted to discharge an average dry weather flow not to exceed 12 mgd. According to SPMUD, in 2016 the Dry Creek WWTP had an average dry weather inflow of 8.2 mgd, with SPMUD's portion being 1.8 mgd, and the Pleasant Grove WWTP had an average dry weather inflow of 7.0 mgd, with SPMUD's portion being 1.9 mgd. Consequently, both plants are well within their operating capacities and there remains adequate capacity to accommodate the projected wastewater flows from this project. Therefore, a less than significant wastewater treatment impact is anticipated.

c. New Stormwater Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be conditioned to require connection into the City's storm drain system, with Best Management Practices and/or Low Impact Development features located within the project's drainage system at a point prior to where the project site runoff will enter the City's storm drain system. Other than on-site improvements, new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required as a result of this project. Therefore, a less than significant stormwater facility impact is anticipated.

d. Water Supplies – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located within the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) service area. The PCWA has a Master Plan, which is periodically updated, to provide water to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary, and includes the option of constructing additional treatment plants. The PCWA collects hook-up fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities.

The PCWA service area is divided into five zones that provide treated and raw water to Colfax, Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln, small portion of Roseville, unincorporated areas of western Placer County, and a small community in Martis Valley near Truckee. The proposed project is located in Zone 1, which is the largest of the five zones. Zone 1 provides water service to

Auburn, Bowman, Ophir, Newcastle, Penryn, Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln, and portions of Granite Bay.

PCWA has planned for growth in the City of Rocklin and sized the water supply infrastructure to meet this growth (PCWA 2006). PCWA has provided a letter regarding the proposed project indicating that the project is within their service area and eligible for service upon execution of a facilities agreement and payment of all required fees and charges. The project site would be served by the Foothill WTP, which treats water diverted from the American River Pump Station near Auburn, and the proposed project's estimated maximum daily water treatment demands would not exceed the plant's permitted capacity. Because the proposed project would be served by a water treatment plant that has adequate capacity to meet the project's projected demand and would not require the construction of a new water treatment plant, the proposed project's water supply and treatment facility impacts would be considered less than significant.

f. Landfill Capacity – *Less than Significant Impact.* The Western Regional landfill, which serves the Rocklin area, has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. The estimated closure date for the landfill is approximately 2036. Development of the project site with urban land uses was included in the lifespan and capacity calculations of the landfill, and a less than significant landfill capacity impact would be anticipated.

g. Solid Waste Regulations – *Less than Significant Impact.* Federal and State regulations regarding solid waste consist of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations and the California Integrated Waste Management Act regulating waste reduction. These regulations primarily affect local agencies and other agencies such as the Landfill Authority. The proposed project will comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations regarding trash and waste and other nuisance-related issues as may be applicable. Recology would provide garbage collection services to the project site, provided their access requirements are met. Therefore, the project would comply with solid waste regulations and the impact would be less than significant.

XVIII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X			
b) Does the project have impacts that are limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)?			X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The preceding analysis demonstrates that these effects will not occur as a consequence of the project.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Degradation of Environment Quality – *Less than Significant with Mitigation.* The project site is mostly surrounded by disturbed and developed land. Based on the project location and the application of mitigation measures for potential biological resources and cultural resources impacts as discussed above, the proposed project does not have the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Although the proposed project could cause a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because of the project design and the application of the recommended mitigation measures and the City’s uniformly applied development policies and standards that will reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

b. Cumulatively Considerable Impacts – *Less than Significant Impact.* Development in the South Placer region as a whole will contribute to regional air pollutant emissions, thereby delaying attainment of Federal and State air quality standards, regardless of development activity in the City of Rocklin and application of mitigation measures. As a result of this potential degradation of the quality of the environment, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. Development of the project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the project represents less vehicle trip generation and associated air quality and greenhouse gas emission impacts than that which was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will alter viewsheds as mixed urban development occurs on vacant land. In addition, new development will also generate new sources of light and glare; as a result, the General Plan EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative aesthetic impacts. Development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in cumulative, long-term impacts on biological resources (vegetation and wildlife), due to the introduction of domestic landscaping, homes, paved surfaces, and the relatively constant presence of people and pets, all of which negatively impact vegetation and wildlife habitat. As a result, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impacts, both at a project-specific Rocklin General Plan buildout level as it relates to biological resources solely within the City of Rocklin, as well as in the context of a cumulative contribution from Rocklin General Plan buildout as it relates to biological resources in the region. Development of the proposed project

represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in significant noise impacts as a result of the introduction of new noise sources and additional traffic and people. As a result, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impacts. Development of the project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the project represents less vehicle trip generation than that which was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in significant transportation/traffic impacts as a result of the creation of additional housing, employment and purchasing opportunities which generate vehicle trips. As a result, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative transportation/traffic impacts. Development of the project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the project represents less vehicle trip generation than that which was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

The approval of the proposed project would not result in any new impacts that are limited, but cumulatively considerable, that are not already disclosed in the previously prepared environmental documents cited in this report. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

c. Adverse Effects to Humans – *Less than Significant.* Because the development of the project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly beyond those that were previously identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Section 5. References:

City of Rocklin General Plan, October 2012

City of Rocklin General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, August 2012

City of Rocklin General Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report, August 2011

City of Rocklin Zoning Ordinance, Title 17 of the Rocklin Municipal Code

City of Rocklin Design Review Guidelines

Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc., Environmental Noise Assessment, Manger's Residence at Rocklin Self Storage Facility, March 30, 2018

KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., Rocklin Self Storage Project Air Quality Study, October 23, 2018

Raney Planning and Management, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, Stanford Ranch – Phases IV, Parcels 54, 55, 57 and 71 (West Oaks) Project, January 2013

Attachments

Attachment A – Project Vicinity Map

Attachment B – Project Site Plan

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

**STANFORD RANCH STORAGE
(DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004)**

Project Name and Description

The Stanford Ranch Storage project proposes the construction and operation of a new 93,459 +/- square foot self-storage facility consisting of eleven one-story metal storage buildings totaling 86,469 +/- square feet and a two-story wood framed building which is for the office (1,200 +/- square feet) and residential use of the live-in manager’s unit (1,280 +/- square feet), with 239 RV and boat storage spaces on a 9.8 +/- acre site. The project would have access onto West Stanford Ranch Road and West Oaks Boulevard. This project will require Design Review and Conditional Use Permit entitlements. For more detail please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Project Location:

The project site is generally located on the south side of West Stanford Ranch Road, approximately 500 feet east of Sunset Boulevard (1400 West Stanford Ranch Road), in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers are 017-086-009 (portion), 017-086-010 (portion) and 017-086-011.

Project Sponsor’s Name:

The applicant is Timothy Alatorre and the property owner is Fort Sutter Company.

Basis for Mitigated Negative Declaration Determination

The City of Rocklin finds that as originally submitted the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. However, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent, which will avoid these effects or mitigate these effects to a point where clearly no significant effect will occur. Therefore a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared. The Initial Study supporting the finding stated above and describing the mitigation measures including in the project is incorporated herein by this reference. This determination is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary of Resources Section 15064 – Determining the Significance of the Environmental Effects Caused by a Project, Section 15065 – Mandatory Findings of Significance, and 15070 – Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for this Project.

Date Circulated for Review: _____ February 22, 2019 _____

Date Adopted: _____ March 19, 2019 _____

Signature: _____

David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Director

Initial Study Page 87 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
---	--

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
Stanford Ranch Storage
(DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., as amended by Chapter 1232) requires all lead agencies before approving a proposed project to adopt a reporting and monitoring program for adopted or required changes to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation as required by AB 3180 (Cortese) effective on January 1, 1989 and Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. This law requires the lead agency responsible for the certification of an environmental impact report or adoption of a mitigated negative declaration to prepare and approve a program to both monitor all mitigation measures and prepare and approve a report on the progress of the implementation of those measures.

The responsibility for monitoring assignments is based upon the expertise or authority of the person(s) assigned to monitor the specific activity. The City of Rocklin Community Development Director or his designee shall monitor to assure compliance and timely monitoring and reporting of all aspects of the mitigation monitoring program.

The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies the mitigation measures associated with the project and identifies the monitoring activities required to ensure their implementation through the use of a table format. The columns identify Mitigation Measure, Implementation and Monitoring responsibilities. Implementation responsibility is when the project through the development stages is checked to ensure that the measures are included prior to the actual construction of the project such as: Final Map (FM), Improvement Plans (IP), and Building Permits (BP). Monitoring responsibility identifies the department responsible for monitoring the mitigation implementation such as: Community Development (CDD), Public Services (PS), Community Facilities (CFD), Police (PD), and Fire Departments (FD).

The following table presents the Mitigation Monitoring Plan with the Mitigation Measures, Implementation, and Monitoring responsibilities. After the table is a general Mitigation Monitoring Report Form, which will be used as the principal reporting form for this, monitoring program. Each mitigation measure will be listed on the form and provided to the responsible department.

Revisions in the project plans and/or proposal have been made and/or agreed to by the applicant prior to this Negative Declaration being released for public review which will avoid the effects or mitigate those effects to a point where clearly no significant effects will occur. There is no substantial evidence before the City of Rocklin that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15070. These mitigation measures are as follows:

Initial Study Page 1 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	<i>Stanford Ranch Storage</i> <i>DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004</i>
--	--

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources:

To address the potential impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-1 The applicant/developer shall attempt to time the removal of potential nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds to avoid the nesting season (February 1 - September 15).

If vegetation removal and/or project grading or construction activities occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February 1 – September 15), the applicant/developer shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of development activities. The survey shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be valid for one construction season. Documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary tree removal may proceed. If there is a break in construction activity of more than 14 days, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

If the survey results are positive (active nests are found), impacts shall be avoided by the establishment of appropriate buffers. The biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the City to determine the size of an appropriate buffer area (CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 500-foot buffers). Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist may be required if the activity has the potential to adversely affect an active nest.

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (September 16 – January 31), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds to a less than significant level.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities to occur within the nesting season, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for nesting raptors and migratory birds to the City’s Community Development Department. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the biologist shall consult with the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as detailed above.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant/Developer
City of Rocklin Community Development Department
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Initial Study Page 2 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
--	--

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Cultural Resources:

To address the potential of impacts to known cultural resources and the potential discovery of unknown cultural resources, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

V.-1 If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources would include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City’s Environmental Services Manager shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).

IMPLEMENTATION:

If evidence of undocumented cultural resources is discovered during grading or construction operations, ground disturbance in the area shall be halted and a qualified professional

Initial Study Page 3 Reso. No. PC-2019-04	Stanford Ranch Storage DR2018-0004 and U2018-0004
--	--

archaeologist, the City's Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. Other procedures as specifically noted in the mitigation measure shall also be followed and complied with.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant/Developer
City of Rocklin Community Development Department
Native American Heritage Commission

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Noise:

To address the project’s potential traffic noise impacts to the manager’s residence, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

XII.-1 All windows of the manager’s residence from which West Stanford Ranch Road would be visible shall be upgraded to windows with an STC rating of 32.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the approval of building plans and prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the windows facing West Stanford Ranch Road shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 32.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department

MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT FORMS

Project Title: Stanford Ranch Storage

Mitigation Measures:

Completion Date: (Insert date or time period that mitigation measures were completed)

Responsible Person:

(Insert name and title)

Monitoring/Reporting:

Community Development Director

Effectiveness Comments:

ATTACHMENT A – PROJECT VICINITY MAP



ATTACHMENT B – PROJECT SITE PLAN

