RESOLUTION NO. PC-2019-

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential (DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-004 and SD2017-0005)

WHEREAS, the City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator prepared an Initial Study on the Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project (DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005) (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 and incorporated by this reference, are recommended for approval 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 Economic and Community Development Director, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677. The custodian of these documents and other materials is the Rocklin Economic and Community Development Director.

Section 7. Upon approval of the Project by the City Council, 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 ___ day of _____, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners: 

NOES: Commissioners: 

ABSENT: Commissioners: 

ABSTAIN: Commissioners: 

____________________________________
Chairperson

ATTEST:

____________________________________
Secretary
ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential

DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005

Northeast corner of Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard in the City of Rocklin
APN’s 010-470-003, -008, -021, -022, -023, -024, -026

July 26, 2019

PREPARED BY:

David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Director, (916) 625-5162

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 Economic and Community Development Department, Planning Division, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677 (916) 625-5160.

APPLICANT/OWNER:

The applicant and property owner is St. Anton Communities.
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 Quarry Place Apartments and Cobblestone Single Family Residential 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. The reference materials are 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, Current Environmental Documents.

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.

During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Environmental Services staff or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Council agenda can be obtained by contacting the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95667 or via the internet at http://www.rocklin.ca.us.

Within five days of project approval, the City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk. The Notice of Determination will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues that were presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.
SECTION 2. INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY AND DETERMINATION

A. Summary Information

Project Title:
Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential

Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Rocklin, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677

Contact Person and Phone Number:
David Mohlenbrok, Environmental Services Manager, 916-625-5162

Project Location:
The project site is generally located on the northeastern corner of Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard, in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers are 010-470-003, -008, -021, -022, -023, -024, and -026.

Project Sponsor’s Name:
The applicant and property owner is St. Anton Communities.

Current General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR), Medium Density Residential (MDR), and Retail Commercial (RC)

Proposed General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR), Medium Density Residential (MDR), and Retail Commercial (RC) (no change)

Current Zoning: Multiple Family Residential (R-3), Single Family Residential 3,500 square foot minimum lot size (R1-3.5), and Retail Business (C-2)

Proposed Zoning: Multiple Family Residential (R-3), Single Family Residential 3,500 square foot minimum lot size (R1-3.5), and Retail Business (C-2) (no change)

Description of the Project:
The Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project proposes the construction of a multi-family apartment complex consisting of 180 multi-family units, two commercial structures and a single family residential subdivision consisting of 40 lots, on an approximately 15.22 +/- acre site in the City of Rocklin. This project will require Design Review, Oak Tree Preservation Plan and Tentative Subdivision Map entitlements. The project site was previously graded for retail commercial lots and portions of the site are...
currently developed with retail commercial uses (former K-Mart building). For more detail please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The proposed project site is mostly developed and is bound by Pacific Street to the west, multi-family residences, Sunset Boulevard and retail commercial uses to the south, Woodside Drive and Ruhkala Road to the east, and retail commercial uses to the north. To the west of Pacific Street are retail commercial uses and the Union Pacific Railroad. To the south of Pacific Street and east of Woodside Drive are single-family residences.

**Other Actions Which May Be Required for Project Implementation (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 approval of construction of water facilities
- South Placer Municipal Utility District approval of construction of sewer facilities
- Placer County Air Pollution Control District approval of dust control plan

**B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture/Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

- [x] 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  Date  
Community Development Department Director
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SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The project site is generally located on the northeastern corner of Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers are 010-470-003, -008, -021, -022, -023, -024, and -026 (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 Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project proposes the construction of a multi-family apartment complex consisting of 180 multi-family residential units, two commercial structures totaling 9,700 +/- sq. ft. (3,500 and 6,200 square foot buildings), and a single-family residential subdivision consisting of 40 lots on an approximately 15.22 +/- acre site in the City of Rocklin. The multi-family portion of the project will consist of nine three-story buildings, two single story buildings containing the leasing office/clubhouse and a pool house, and 333 parking stalls. There will be four 24,770 +/- sq. ft. buildings, two 27,570 +/- sq. ft. buildings and three 12,385 +/- sq. ft. buildings, providing 78 1-bedroom units, 72 2-bedroom units and 30 3-bedroom units in total. The project site currently contains a former K-Mart building, undeveloped pad graded retail commercial lots, and a paved parking lot. The project will need the following entitlements from the City of Rocklin: Design Review (DR2017-0001 and DR2019-0007) for the landscaping, architectural designs, colors and materials of the multi-family and retail development areas respectively, an Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit (TRE2019-0004) for the protection and removal of on- and off-site oak trees, and a Tentative Subdivision Map (SD2017-0005) to create 40 single-family lots. Access to the project would be from Pacific Street, Sunset Boulevard, and Woodside Drive. The project site is partly developed and it is anticipated that site development will involve demolition, trenching and digging for underground utilities and infrastructure, and ultimately the construction of new roadways, driveways, buildings, and landscaping.
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 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
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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 Economic and Community Development Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677 and can also be found on the City’s website under Planning Department, Current Environmental Documents. 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 Economic and 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. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of a 180 unit multi-family subdivision, 40 lot single-family subdivision, and 9,700 sq. ft. retail commercial center on a 15.22 +/- 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 cumulative 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. The project site has been previously graded and mostly developed as a retail commercial center and associated paved parking, and includes a large building that previously was tenanted by a K-Mart. Alteration of the partially developed project site through the construction of 180 multi-family residential units, 40 single-family residential units, and 9,700 +/- sq. ft. of retail
commercial space would change the visual quality of the project site and surrounding. However, since there are no designated scenic vistas, no impact would occur in this regard.

b. Scenic Highway – 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.

c. Visual Character – Less than Significant Impact. Per Public Resources Code section 21071 (a)(2), the City of Rocklin is considered to be an urbanized area because although its population is less than 100,000 persons, the population of Rocklin and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities (the cities of Roseville and Lincoln) combined equals at least 100,000 persons. The construction of 180 multi-family residential units, 40 single-family residential units, and 9,700 +/- sq. ft. of retail commercial space is consistent with the type of development contemplated and analyzed for this area of Rocklin within the Rocklin General Plan. The General Plan EIR analysis included the development of this site with retail commercial uses adjacent to retail commercial, medium density residential and medium-high density residential development. The project site’s General Plan land use designations have since been changed and rezoned from entirely Retail Commercial to High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Retail Commercial. The building structures that are anticipated are of consistent height and scale with the current zoning and land use designations of the site and the surrounding existing retail commercial and residential development, and anticipated future development. Existing buildings in the area include one- and two-story single- and multi-family residential buildings and single and multi-story commercial buildings. These buildings and the anticipated future development of buildings within the nearby and adjacent retail commercial and residential 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. Also applicable to this Project are Quarry District Architectural Guidelines which are meant to inspire and provide designers with basic direction in developing projects that focus on high quality design and use of materials and require review by the City’s Architectural Review Committee. The project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
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. Therefore, the visual impact would be less than significant.

d. Light and Glare – Less than Significant Impact. There are no specific features within the proposed project that would create unusual light and glare. Project homes and streets would have external lighting which would result in increased sources of light and glare being introduced to the project area. However, 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. As a part of the design and development review process for this project, the City will require that lighting standards and fixtures be of a design and size that is compatible with the development and with adjacent areas and be complementary to the architectural style of the buildings. Adverse glare onto adjacent properties is prohibited and more, smaller scale parking lot lights instead of fewer, overly tall and large parking lot lights should be installed. The use of bollard lighting, decorative pole and fixtures is strongly encouraged and exterior light fixtures mounted on building walls should relate to the height of pedestrians and not exceed 8 to 10 feet. Adherence to the design and development review process standards will minimize light and glare impacts to a less than significant level.

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.
II. **AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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))?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 e. Conversion of Farmland, Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act - 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 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. Therefore, 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.

c. and d. Rezone or Conversion of Timberland, Forest Land – No Impact. The project site contains no parcels that are zoned as, or considered forestry lands or timberland. Therefore, 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. AIR QUALITY
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (PM$_{10}$)).

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, a retail commercial, single-family, and multi-family residential development of this type would not be expected to create objectionable odors.

Prior Environmental Analysis:
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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 future development. 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 RCH Group, 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 August 30, 2017, 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 RCH Group 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 RCH Group report, which is summarized below.

The analysis was prepared to estimate the criteria pollutant emissions from project construction and operation. The analysis assumed 185 multi-family units, 45 single family residences, and 9,700 square feet of retail commercial space with associated parking. Because the project is now being proposed at 180 multi-family units and 40 single family residences (the retail commercial square footage is unchanged), the conclusions of the analysis are considered to be conservative. The proposed Quarry Place Apartments and Cobblestone Single Family Residential 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).

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)</th>
<th>Nitrous Oxides (NOx)</th>
<th>Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM\textsubscript{10})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 PM\textsubscript{10}. Therefore, construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD’s nonattainment status for ozone and PM\textsubscript{10}. Accordingly, construction of the proposed project would not violate any ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

**Operational Emissions**

Operational emissions of ROG, NOx, PM\textsubscript{10} and CO 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day)</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown, the project’s operational emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM$_{10}$ 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 PM$_{10}$ are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project’s ozone precursor and PM$_{10}$ emissions would be less than the PCAPCD’s operational project level thresholds, the project would not be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.
As shown in the Operational Emissions table above, the proposed project would not result in emissions in exceedance of the applicable operational-level thresholds of significance for ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) or PM$_{10}$; therefore, impacts related to the cumulative emissions of criteria pollutants for which the PCAPCD area is in non-attainment would be considered less than significant.

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 High and Medium Density Residential and Retail Commercial land uses that are less intense (from a trip generation and associated emissions standpoint) than the Retail Commercial land uses that were anticipated by and analyzed within the General Plan EIR.

**Significance Conclusions:**

a. and b. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, 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 – 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 (PM$_{10}$) 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 PM$_{10}$, and ozone precursors – reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOX).). On October 13, 2016 the PCAPCD adopted updated thresholds of significance of the aforementioned pollutants.

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 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 and Operational Emissions tables above, the project’s construction and operational emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM$_{10}$ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. These thresholds take into account strategies for attaining air quality standards. 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.

For cumulative emissions, the PCAPCD recommends using the region’s existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions and the PCAPCD concluded that if a project’s ozone precursor and PM$_{10}$ 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, NOx and PM$_{10}$ emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds. Thus, the project would not 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 and the impact would be considered less than significant.

c. Sensitive Receptors – Less than Significant Impact. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others, due to the types of population groups or activities involved. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and/or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, childcare centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals and medical clinics. The proposed project involves the development of residential uses; thus, the project would introduce sensitive receptors to the area. The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are the residences located to the east and south 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
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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 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.

The Traffic Impact Analysis Report for Quarry Place Mixed Use (KD Anderson & Associates, November 12, 2018) examined Level of Service (LOS) for ten study intersections affected by the project. Per that report, the project would not result in peak-hour traffic levels that would degrade any study intersection from LOS A, B, C or D to an unacceptable LOS E or F, nor would the project substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak-hour LOS; therefore the project would not generate localized concentrations of CO that would exceed State CO standards or result in substantial CO concentrations. Overall, based on PCAPCD’s screening criteria for localized CO emission impacts, the proposed project would not require further analysis and would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial localized concentrations of CO.

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 Interstate 80 (I-80) is located approximately 1,300 feet east of the site at the closest point. Thus the project would not be subject to substantial DPM emissions associated with freeway traffic and risk levels from I-80 would not expose new receptors to substantial health risk.

Due to the residential 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.

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

d. 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. The proposed project does not involve such land uses nor is it located near any such land uses. Although less common, emissions of DPM from heavy-duty diesel truck traffic could result in objectionable odors. While the proposed project would increase the total amount of vehicle trips in the area, the increase in area vehicle activity would not necessarily create an increase in heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, because the traffic increase would mostly be a result of increased residential land uses. Residential land uses are not typically associated with heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, and thus the increase in daily trips attributable to residential land uses would mainly involve single passenger vehicles that are not typically considered to be sources of objectionable odors. Diesel fumes associated with diesel-fueled equipment and heavy-duty trucks, such as from construction activities or operations of emergency generators, could be found to be objectionable. However, as addressed above, construction is temporary and construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and would likely only occur over portions of the project area at a time.
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, because the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of 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 other emissions such as those leading to the creation of objectionable odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005*
DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project will modify habitats through the removal of native and other plant material; the project site does contain oak trees, some of which will be removed with implementation of the project. Impacts to wetlands and riparian areas and 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:
The firm of Sierra Nevada Arborists, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in arboriculture, prepared an arborist report for the Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project. Their report, dated September 14, 2017 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 Sierra Nevada Arborists has a professional reputation that makes their 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 Sierra Nevada Arborists report, which are summarized below.

**Project Site Description**

The project site has been previously developed as a retail commercial center and contains a building that previously housed a K-Mart, undeveloped graded lots for retail commercial uses, and associated paved parking. Vegetation on the project site is composed primarily of grass on the undeveloped graded lots and landscaping associated with the parking lot. The eastern boundary of the project site adjacent to Ruhkala Road contains some existing oak trees.

**Significance Conclusions:**

**a. Effect on Protected Species – Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The Rocklin General Plan EIR does not identify the project site as a location that contains sensitive biological resources and 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. The site is located in a mostly developed, suburban environment and as such it provides habitat to rodents, small mammals, and birds and bats, typical of a suburban area. Tree-nesting raptor species forage and nest in a variety of habitats throughout Placer County and the mature trees on the project site do provide suitable nesting habitat.

To address the potential impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, the following mitigation measure 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 grading/construction activities occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February 1 – September 15), the City and/or contractor shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of grading/construction 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. Prior to*
the start of grading/construction activities, documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City of Rocklin Community Development Department and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary structure removal may proceed. If there is a break in grading/construction activities 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 grading/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.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project’s Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

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

b. and c. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands – No Impact. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory database does not identify any wetlands on the project site. The project site is a previously developed retail commercial center and does not contain any riparian habitat or wetlands which are state or federally protected. Therefore, no impact to riparian habitat and wetlands is anticipated.

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 mostly disturbed habitat. The majority of the surrounding area is developed in an urban fashion, including residential uses to the east and south, and commercial uses to the north and west of the project. The project site is located in a developed area that includes road and existing residential and commercial developments, which isolates the project site 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. Due to the proximity of local roadways to the site (Pacific Street, Sunset Boulevard, Woodside Drive, and Ruhkala Road), the amount of surrounding development and the lack of established wildlife corridors and perennial water courses on the project site, 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. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

e. Local Policies/Ordinances – Less than Significant with Mitigation. 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.

The project site includes a total of twelve (12) native oak trees within the boundaries or immediately adjacent to the project site (7 Blue Oak, 4 Interior Live Oak and 1 Coast Live Oak). Two (2) trees are recommended for removal by the project arborist as being dead, dying, or a hazard, and one of the native oak trees is proposed for removal as a part of the development of the Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project, specifically associated with Quarry Place Apartments frontage improvements on Ruhkala Road. In addition, grading and construction activities could impact on-site trees to remain and immediately adjacent oak trees.
To ensure compliance with the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and to compensate for the removal of the oak trees on the project site, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-2 a) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant/developer shall submit a grading plan with a list of all existing on- and off-site oak tree(s) and standard notes to ensure the protection of the off-site oak tree(s) that are designated to remain. The grading plan shall be review and approved by the Community Development Director and the City Engineer to ensure that oak trees not scheduled for removal will be protected from construction activities in compliance with the pertinent sections of the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

b) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant/developer shall retain a certified arborist to review the design of the project improvements and recommend measures to protect oak trees that are designated to remain, both during construction and afterwards. These measures shall be incorporated into the project’s grading and/or improvement plans, for review and approval by the City Engineer. The protection measures shall include appropriate fencing around those trees to remain. The protection measures shall be approved prior to the issuance of improvement plans or a grading permit for all or any portion of the project.

c) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant shall retain a certified arborist to prepare and implement an inspection plan for review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer which provides for the periodic inspection of the site during grading and construction activities. During grading and construction activities, the certified arborist shall provide documentation to the City Engineer that the approved protection measures have been properly implemented and are being maintained.

d) Upon completion of the project and prior to the first building’s final inspection/issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project arborist shall prepare a report to verify the on- and off-site oak tree(s) that were designated to remain have not been negatively impacted by construction of the project. If the project has negatively impacted any on- and/or off-site oak tree(s), then prior to a final inspection/issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first building, the developer shall mitigate for all oak trees removed as a result of the project consistent with the requirements of the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code Section 17.77.080.B). The required mitigation shall be calculated using the formula provided in the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and to that end the project arborist shall provide the following information:

- The total number of surveyed oak trees;
- The total number of oak trees to be removed;
• The total number of oak trees to be removed that are to be removed because they are sick or dying, and
• The total, in inches, of the trunk diameters at breast height (TDBH) of all surveyed oak trees on the site in each of these categories.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project’s Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will comply with the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and reduce impacts related to oak tree removal to a less than significant level.

There are no facts or circumstances presented by the proposed project which create conflicts with other local policies or ordinances 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. CULTURAL RESOURCES
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project could affect known or unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological sites, and/or human remains 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 (including human remains) 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 cultural, 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 historic resources pursuant to §15064.5; therefore no impacts to historic resources are anticipated.
b. and c. Archaeological Resources—Less Than Significant With Mitigation. As noted above, the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered cultural resources.

To address the potential of impacts to known cultural resources and the potential discovery of unknown cultural resources, the following mitigation measures are 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).

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project’s Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

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.
c. 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) (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. ENERGY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:**

**Project Impacts:**

The proposed project would be anticipated to use energy resources during project construction and operation, but such use would not be in a wasteful or inefficient manner, nor would such use conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or 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 the cumulative demand for electrical and natural gas services as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included an increased demand for electrical and natural gas services, energy consumption impacts, and a cumulative increase in demand for electrical and natural gas services and associated infrastructure and increased infrastructure expansions to serve future development (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-34, pages 4.13-23 through 4.13-32 and pages 5.0-47 through 5.0-48). Mitigation...
measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Public Services and Facilities and Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage coordination with utility service providers and energy and resource conservation. The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in energy consumption impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24), through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would reduce energy consumption, and through compliance with local, state and federal standards related to energy consumption.

**Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:**

The consumption of energy as a result of development activities is discussed in the Rocklin General Plan. Policies and mitigation measures have been included in the General Plan that encourage coordination with utility service providers and the conservation of energy and resources.

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.

**Significance Conclusions:**

**a. Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would use energy resources for the operation (i.e., electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (i.e., gasoline, diesel fuel and electricity) generated by the project, and from off-road vehicles generated by and associated with the construction of the project.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) provides both electrical and natural gas service within the City of Rocklin. According to PG&E, in 2015 Placer County used a total of 2,902 million kWh of electricity. The project would increase electricity use in the county by a minimal amount. PG&E’s electrical service area extends far beyond Placer County, and draws on a variety of sources for electricity, including hydroelectric, natural gas, nuclear and renewable resources. According to PG&E, in 2015 Placer County used approximately 78.8 million therms of natural gas. Similar to electricity, the project’s natural gas use would represent a minimal increase of natural gas usage within the county, and a smaller portion of PG&E’s total natural gas service. PG&E would be able to absorb the additional demand for electricity and natural gas that would result from the project because it would represent a very minimal increase.
compared to PG&E’s current demand and supply, and because PG&E plans for additional development within its service area, including the City of Rocklin.

Project construction and operation would comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements, which would ensure that electricity use associated with the operation of the project would not be wasteful or inefficient.

Once constructed, the project would also increase the annual use of transportation fuel. The project is located in proximity to commercial services and transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which could reduce vehicle use and the associated fuel consumption. The project does not include any elements that would result in an unusually high use of transportation fuel as compared to other, similar, development.

The project would be in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. In addition, energy providers are actively implementing measures to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and to improve energy efficiency. For example, PG&E is responsible for the mix of energy resources used to provide electricity for its customers, and it is in the process of implementing the Statewide Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) to increase the proportion of renewable energy (e.g. solar and wind) within its energy portfolio. Based on this requirement, PG&E is expected to procure at least 50% of its electricity resources from renewable energy resources by 2030. In 2016, renewable resources provided 33% of PG&E’s electricity supply. Other Statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g. the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), would improve vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time.

For the above reasons, the project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the project. The project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Rocklin, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Although improvements to City’s pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems would provide further opportunities for alternative transit, the project would be linked closely with existing networks that, in large part, are sufficient for most residents or employees of the project and the City of Rocklin as a whole. For these reasons, and others (as described previously), the project would be expected to result in a less than significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.
b. Conflict or Obstruct with State or Local Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is not part of a state or local plan for renewable energy and the project itself does not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for energy efficiency. As noted above, the project would be required to comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to conflicting with or obstructing a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
## VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 seismic safety and construction and design standards contained in the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code would reduce risks associated with seismic hazards such as liquefaction. Compliance with these, and 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 by Chapter 15.28 of the Municipal Code, 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.

f. Paleontological Resource and Unique Geological Feature – Less Than Significant Impact. The project site and project area are not known or considered likely to contain a unique paleontological resource or a unique geological feature; therefore direct or indirect impacts to these resources would be less than significant.
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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 RCH Group, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis report for the proposed project. This analysis was prepared to estimate the project’s greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities, motor vehicle trips, and utility use. Their report, dated August 30, 2017, 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 RCH Group 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 RCH Group report, which is summarized below.

**Greenhouse Gas Setting**

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 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e/yr. For operational emissions, the updated thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MT CO\textsubscript{2}e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MT CO\textsubscript{2}e/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 CO\textsubscript{2}e/yr threshold would not necessarily result in substantial impacts, if certain efficiency thresholds are
The efficiency thresholds, which are based on service populations and square footage, are presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency Thresholds</th>
<th>Residential (MT CO₂e/capita)</th>
<th>Non-Residential (MT CO₂e/1,000 sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA, October 13, 2016.*

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 to be 737 MTCO₂e in the first year and 247 MTCO₂e in the second year, which are below the 1,100 MTCO₂e/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 2,933 MTCO₂e/year which would be in excess of the 1,100 MTCO₂e significance threshold. The efficiency of the proposed project must therefore be evaluated to determine if there will be a GHG impact. Accordingly, further analysis in comparison to the applicable efficiency threshold is required.

As presented in the table above, the PCAPCD efficiency thresholds are broken down into residential or non-residential project types, and further broken down into urban or rural settings. Accordingly, the proposed project’s operational GHG emissions per capita are compared to the efficiency threshold for an urban residential project type of 4.5 MTCO₂e/yr/capita. Based on Department of Finance estimates of the average household size of 2.76 persons per household in the City of Rocklin, the proposed project could generate a population of approximately 658 people. As a result, the proposed project’s operational GHG emissions per capita are estimated to be 4.46 MTCO₂e/yr/capita, which is below the applicable efficiency threshold.

Because the levels of construction emissions are below the 10,000 MTCO₂e/year significance threshold and the proposed project’s operational GHG emissions per capita is estimated to be below the urban residential efficiency threshold of 5.5 MTCO₂e/yr/capita, 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 for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs and the impact of the proposed project on global climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would be considered less than significant.

CalEEMod estimates the population associated with the residential portion of the project to be 658. The efficiency rate for the project would be 4.46 MTCO₂e/capita (2,933 MTCO₂e divided by 658 residents = 4.46 MTCO₂e/capita) which is below the 4.5 MTCO₂e/capita threshold. The proposed project would therefore 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 is considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX.</th>
<th>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies and applicable City Code and compliance with applicable Federal, State and local laws and regulations would reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials 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 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 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 Conclusion:**

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 – No Impact.** There are no schools within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of the project site. The closest schools are Rocklin Elementary School on Meyers Street which is approximately 3,600 feet away and Springview Middle School on 5th Street which is approximately 3,900 feet away. Retail commercial and residential 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. Further, there are existing rules and regulations, as indicated above, that address hazardous materials management and environmental protection. Therefore, there is no impact related to hazardous emissions or hazardous materials within one quarter mile of a school.

d. **Hazardous Site List – Less Than Significant.** 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 July 22, 2019 and no hazardous sites were identified on the project site. Therefore, there is no impact related to a hazardous materials site on the project site.

e. Airport Hazards and Noise – 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 or noise impact.

f. 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.

g. Wildland Fires – Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a mostly developed retail commercial and residential area, surrounded by suburban development including other structures and roadways. 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.
**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) 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; or</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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., b., c., and e. Water Quality Standards and Groundwater Management – *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 purposes of the BMP/LID features are to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system and to provide opportunities for groundwater recharge. 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. The purposes of the BMP/LID features are to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system and to provide opportunities for groundwater recharge. 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. In this instance, the project has not been designed to provide on-site detention. Substantial erosion, siltation or flooding, on- or off-site, exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems, substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or the impediment or re-direction of flood flows would not be anticipated to occur.

Therefore, violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would not occur, surface or groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded, and conflicts with
or obstruction of a water quality control plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

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 in comparison to the overall groundwater recharge area. 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, groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded or supplies decreased and conflicts with, obstruction of or impediment of a sustainable groundwater management plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

d. Release of Pollutants in Flood Hazard, Tsunami or Seiche Zones – Less Than Significant Impact. According to FEMA flood maps (Map Panels 06061C0961H, effective date November 2, 2018 and 06061C0963H, effective date November 2, 2018) the developable portion of the project site is located in flood zone X, 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 tsunami or seiche. Therefore the proposed project does not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones and a less than significant impact would be anticipated.
LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Approval of the project would allow the construction and occupation of a 180-unit multi-family apartment complex, 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses and a 40-unit single family residential subdivision on a 15.22 +/- acre site. The project site is designated Retail Commercial (RC), High Density Residential (HDR), and Medium Density Residential (MDR) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned High Density Residential (R-3), Single Family Residential 3,500 square foot minimum lot size (R1-3.5) and Retail Business (C-2). The project requires Design Review and Tentative Subdivision Map entitlements to allow for a project containing retail commercial, single-family residential, and multi-family residential as is 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 partially developed as a retail commercial center and the entire project is within the City of Rocklin. The proposed project would construct 180 multi-family residences, 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses and 40 single-family residences at this location, which would not physically divide an established community. Therefore there is no division of community impact.

b. **Plan, Policy or Regulation Conflict – Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is designated Retail Commercial (RC), High Density Residential (HDR), and Medium Density Residential (MDR) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned High Density Residential (R-3), Single Family Residential 3,500 square foot minimum lot size (R1-3.5) and Retail Business (C-2). The project requires Design Review, and Tentative Subdivision Map entitlements to allow for a project containing retail commercial, single-family, and multi-family residential as is being proposed. The proposed project is consistent with the site’s land use and zoning designations and would be compatible with the existing development of retail commercial and residential uses in the project vicinity. Therefore, 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 adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
### 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 has no mineral resources as classified by the State Geologist. The City 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII. NOISE

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 not result in an exposure of residents to traffic noise levels in excess of City noise level standards,

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 RCH Group, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in noise, prepared an environmental noise assessment of the proposed project. Their report, dated May 2019, 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 RCH Group 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 RCH Group, 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 (L_{eq}). The L_{eq} is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor, L_{dn}, and shows very good correlation with community response to noise. The day/night average level (L_{dn}) 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 L_{dn} 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 Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard, this analysis focuses on whether roadway noise levels would exceed City of Rocklin exterior or interior noise level standards at the residences 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**

As noted above, the noise source concerns for this project are associated with the adjacent roadways of Pacific Street 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.
**Sensitive Receptors**

Noise sensitive receptors include residences, schools, hospitals, churches and similar uses that are sensitive to noise. Sensitive land uses in the vicinity include the Lyn Roc Senior Apartments located approximately 20 feet to the south of the project boundary, Quarry Oaks Apartments located approximately 60 feet to the east, single family homes located approximately 150 feet to the south, and Sutter Ridge Apartments located approximately 300 feet to the southeast of the project site. The proposed project itself will also be introducing noise sensitive receptors with the multi-family and single family components of the project.

**Traffic Noise**

To determine traffic noise levels on the project site, RCH Group, took short-term and long-term noise measurements at eight locations on the project site and utilized project generated average daily traffic as documented in the project’s traffic impact analysis as an input into the FHWA traffic noise model. The table below shows the predicted future traffic noise levels at the building facades closest to the adjacent roadways of the proposed project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance (ft.)</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Levels, Ldn (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facades Closest to Pacific Street</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facades Closest to Sunset Boulevard</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: RCH Group, 2017

It should be noted that the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard applies specifically to outdoor use areas or “outdoor activity” areas, which in the project’s case is the pool area of the multi-family portion of the project and the rear yards of the single-family portion of the project. The estimated noise level at the single-family residential facades includes shielding from proposed sound walls. Per the RCH Assessment “Future noise levels in the single family backyards would be approximately 57 dB CNEI at the closest lots to Pacific Street and approximately 57dB Ldn at the closest lots to Sunset Boulevard.” The pool area of the multi-family portion of the project would be approximately 300 feet east of Pacific Street which would be 75 feet farther away from Pacific Street than the residential façade closest to Pacific Street therefore the noise level at the pool area would be less than 57 dB Ldn. The data in the table above indicates that future traffic noise levels at outdoor activity areas of the proposed project site are predicted to comply with the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard. Therefore, no additional exterior traffic noise reduction measures would be required.
**Interior Traffic Noise Levels**

Standard construction practices, consistent with the Uniform Building Code typically provides an exterior-to-interior noise level reduction of approximately 20-25 dB, assuming that air conditioning is included for each unit, which allows residents to close windows for the required acoustical isolation. Therefore, as long as exterior noise levels at the building facades do not exceed 70 dB Ldn, the interior noise levels will typically comply with the interior noise level standard of 45 dB Ldn.

Based upon an exterior noise exposure of up to 57 dB Ldn and a conservative reduction of 20 dB, interior noise levels of up to 37 dB Ldn are predicted on the interiors of the residential units closest to Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard. These noise levels comply with the City of Rocklin 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard.

**Vibration Levels**

Construction operations have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and operations involved. The ground vibration levels associated with various types of construction equipment are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver (impact)</td>
<td>upper range: 1.518</td>
<td>upper range: 2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typical: 0.644</td>
<td>typical: 0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver (sonic)</td>
<td>upper range: 0.734</td>
<td>upper range: 1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typical: 0.170</td>
<td>typical: 0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006

Note: Vibration levels at 20 feet were calculated using the equation provided by FTA that may be used to estimate vibration at different distances based on a reference ppv at 25 feet for various construction equipment.

Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. The effects of ground vibration may be imperceptible at the lowest levels, low rumbling sounds and detectable vibrations at moderate levels, and slight damage to nearby structures at the highest levels.
At the highest levels of vibration, damage to structures is primarily architectural (e.g., loosening and cracking or plaster or stucco coatings) and rarely results in structural damage. For most structures, a peak particle velocity (ppv) threshold of 0.5 inch per second or less is sufficient to avoid structural damage. The Federal Transit Administration recommends a threshold of 0.5 ppv for residential and commercial structures, 0.25 ppv for historic buildings and archaeological sites, and 0.2 ppv for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings.

**Significance Conclusions:**

**a. and b. Generation of Noise or Vibration – Less than Significant Impact.** 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 substantial temporary increases in the ambient noise environment or generation of excessive groundborne noise levels during construction would be less than significant.

As noted above, and assuming the masonry walls proposed as a part of the project, exterior noise levels at the outdoor activity areas for both the single- and multi-family residences are predicted to be 57 dB Ldn or less which does not exceed the City’s 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard. This exterior noise level equates to interior noise levels of up to 37 dB Ldn, which does not exceed the City’s 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. Therefore, noise reduction measures will not be required and impacts associated with substantial temporary or permanent increases in the ambient noise environment or generation of excessive groundborne noise levels during project operations would be less than significant.

Construction and operation of the project would not involve the use of any equipment or processes that would result in potentially significant levels of ground vibration (i.e., pile drivers that could be above 0.5 ppv). The closest structures to the project site are more than 20 feet from project construction. As shown in the Representative Vibration Source Levels for Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005.
Construction Equipment table above, the predicted vibration levels from vibratory rollers, bulldozers, loaded trucks and jackhammers at a distance of 20 feet would not exceed the 0.5 ppv threshold for residential and commercial structures. Therefore, the generation of excessive groundborne vibration is anticipated to be less than significant.

c. 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 a public or private airport, and is therefore not subject to excessive aircraft noise related to airport operations. Therefore, there is no airport related noise impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV.</th>
<th>POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Induce substantial unplanned 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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project will result in the construction of 40 single-family residential units, 180 multi-family residential units, and 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses on a partially developed site, which would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace substantial numbers of people or housing.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated population and housing impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included population growth and availability of housing opportunities (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.11-1 through 4.11-13). The analysis found that while development and buildout...
of the General Plan can result in population and housing impacts, implementation of the General Plan would not contribute to a significant generation of growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections nor would it displace substantial numbers of housing units or people. Moreover, the project will not construct off-site infrastructure that would induce substantial development, unplanned or otherwise. As such, population and housing impacts were determined to be less than significant.

**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 Retail Commercial (RC), High Density Residential (HDR), and Medium Density Residential (MDR). The addition of 40 single-family residences, 180 multi-family residences, and 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses is not considered to induce substantial unplanned population growth in this area, nor does the project represent a significant addition to a City that is projected to have approximately 29,283 dwelling units at the buildout of the General Plan (the proposed project’s 220 units equates to 0.75 percent of the anticipated 29,283 citywide dwelling units). In addition, the project does not include any extension of roads or other infrastructure other than what is necessary to provide access and services to the project site. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant population growth impact.

b. **Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing People or Housing – Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is currently developed with retail commercial uses and the project includes the construction of 220 residential units which represents an increase in housing. The displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere will not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.
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:

- Fire protection? **X**
- Police protection? **X**
- Schools? **X**
- Parks?
- Other public facilities? **X**

**DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:**

**Project Impacts:**

The proposed project would create a need for the provision of new and/or expanded public services or facilities, but compliance with General Plan goals and policies and payment of necessary fees, including participation in any applicable financing district, would 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 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.

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 require 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 requirements for certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special needs to mitigate the demands/needs.

**Significance Conclusions:**

a. **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 #1 on Rocklin Road, which is approximately 0.79 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. 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 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. Parks – Less than Significant Impact.** The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City of Rocklin. Development of the proposed project could increase the use of nearby park and recreation facilities. Funding for park and recreation facilities development and maintenance is primarily from the development fees, the general fund and financing districts, 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 the construction and maintenance of park and recreation facilities and reduce impacts to parks to less than significant.

**a. 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) 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. **RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:**

**Project Impacts:**

The proposed project, the development and occupation of 180 multi-family residential units, 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses and 40 single-family residential units would be anticipated to increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities but not 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:**

Initial Study Page 78
Reso. No.

Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential
DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005
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.** The proposed project, a residential apartment complex, 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. Although the multi-family portion of the project includes outdoor courtyards/lawn areas, a dog park area, a fitness center and a pool, the residents 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.
**XVII. TRANSPORTATION**

**Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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.

**Project-Level Environmental Analysis:**

The firm of KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in transportation, prepared a traffic impact analysis of the proposed project. Their report, dated November 12, 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.

**Daily Trip Generation**

An estimate of the proposed project’s daily and p.m. peak hour trip generation has been made based on trip generation rates derived from the City of Rocklin Travel Demand Model and the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) 9th Edition Trip Generation Manual. 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 compare and evaluate the relative impact of the proposed project based on the difference in the site’s previous use as a K-Mart and actual daily trip generation of the Quarry Place Apartments and Cobblestone Single Family
Residential (and retail commercial) project. The table below identifies the trip generation estimates for the proposed project. As shown, the K-Mart could have generated 3,010 daily trips, which is roughly 421 more daily trips than the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Residences</td>
<td>180 du’s</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residences</td>
<td>40 du’s</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail – General</td>
<td>6.20 ksf</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>3.5 ksf</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-by - Retail</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;3&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;4&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;7&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-by Fast Food</td>
<td>49% / 50%</td>
<td>&lt;824&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;35&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;34&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;69&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;29&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;28&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;57&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net New Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail-Kmart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86 ksf</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above comparison is provided for informational purposes only; the analysis below that addresses intersection Level of Service (LOS) considers the trip generation that would be yielded by the proposed project (2,589 daily trips), which is 421 fewer daily trips than what the former K-Mart use of the site would have generated. In addition, the Cobblestone single family portion of the project is located in areas where retail commercial land use was assumed, and because single family residential development as a whole generates fewer daily trips than retail commercial, there are even fewer trips anticipated to be generated from the project than the 421 noted above.

*Current Background Traffic Conditions*

Roadways providing access to the project site will be Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard via existing driveways and a newly proposed driveway onto Woodside Drive. Pacific Street is primarily a four-lane east-west street that runs parallel to Interstate 80 through Rocklin and links Taylor Road in the Town of Loomis in the east with the Atlantic Street interchange on Interstate 80 on in the west. Sunset Boulevard is a four-lane/six-lane northwest-southeast street that runs parallel to State Route 65 through Rocklin and which links the established area of Rocklin near Pacific Street with State Route 65 at the western limits of the City. Woodside Drive is a two lane collector street running northerly behind the project site from Sunset Boulevard.
New traffic counts were taken for this study in 2016 to supplement data collected by the City of Rocklin in April 2016; all counts were conducted when Rocklin schools were in session.

The table below identifies current intersection Levels of Service (LOS) at the ten study locations. As shown, with one exception, the overall LOS at each intersection is LOS C or better for both AM and PM peak hours, which meets the City’s minimum LOS C standard. The Sunset Boulevard/3rd Street/Springview Drive intersection operates at LOS D in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. The Rocklin General Plan and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) indicate that this intersection will someday be widened to provide three through lanes on Sunset Boulevard in each direction, however, it is also important to note that the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection is identified under General Plan Circulation Element Policy C-10.B as an exception to the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard.
### EXISTING INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / Springview Dr / 3rd St</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Woodside Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Sunset Blvd</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / West access (overall)</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound right turn</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Central access (overall)</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound right turn</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound left turn</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific St / Walmart / Les Schwab</td>
<td>NB/SB Stop</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(overall)</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound approach</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound approach</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound left turn</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound left turn</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / Woodside Drive</td>
<td>All-Way Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** indicates conditions in excess of adopted minimum LOS standard
Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions and Levels of Service

Project trips were superimposed onto the current background traffic volumes to create the “Existing Plus Project” condition, which is reflected in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing Plus Project</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing Plus Project</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS V/C</td>
<td>LOS V/C</td>
<td>LOS V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / Springview Dr / 3rd St</td>
<td>Signal D 0.871</td>
<td>D 0.887</td>
<td>D 0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Woodside Drive</td>
<td>Signal A 0.458</td>
<td>A 0.471</td>
<td>A 0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Sunset Blvd</td>
<td>Signal A 0.505</td>
<td>A 0.521</td>
<td>B 0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / West access (overall)</td>
<td>NB Stop (A) 12.2</td>
<td>B (A) 13.0</td>
<td>B (A) 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound right turn</td>
<td>B (A) 12.0</td>
<td>B (A) 12.9</td>
<td>B (A) 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound left turn</td>
<td>B (A) 10.2</td>
<td>B (A) 10.6</td>
<td>B (A) 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific St / Walmart / Les Schwab (overall)</td>
<td>NB/SB Stop (A) 30.2</td>
<td>D 57.5</td>
<td>E 86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound approach</td>
<td>D 31.5</td>
<td>D 55.0</td>
<td>C 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound approach</td>
<td>A 9.7</td>
<td>A 9.8</td>
<td>B 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound left turn</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound left turn</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin Road / Farrow Street</td>
<td>Signal A 0.306</td>
<td>A 0.385</td>
<td>A 0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street / Rocklin Road</td>
<td>Signal A 0.477</td>
<td>A 0.491</td>
<td>A 0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / Keen Access (overall)</td>
<td>EB/WB Stop (A) 9.9</td>
<td>B 9.8</td>
<td>A 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound approach</td>
<td>A 9.4</td>
<td>A 9.7</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound approach</td>
<td>A 7.4</td>
<td>A 7.4</td>
<td>A 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound left turn</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound left turn</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / Woodside Drive</td>
<td>All-way stop A 7.4</td>
<td>A 7.5</td>
<td>A 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / New Access</td>
<td>Westbound approach</td>
<td>A (2.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Blvd / New Access</td>
<td>Southbound left turn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates conditions in excess of adopted minimum LOS C standard. Highlighted values are a significant impact.

As shown, because the amount of traffic associated with the project is relatively small, the addition of project traffic would not appreciably increase the length of delays occurring at study intersections, and the project does not result in any change to the AM or PM peak hours Level of Service at any location. The delays at driveway approaches to the Pacific Street/Walmart/Les Schwab mid-block location will lengthen with delays indicative of LOS D, E and F conditions depending upon the time of day, however, the City’s Level of Service policy is only applied to formal intersections not driveway approaches. Levels of Service at most intersection locations will remain within the City’s overall LOS C PM peak hour minimum, but there is one exception.

The project will add traffic to the Sunset Boulevard/3rd Street/Springview Drive intersection which already operates at LOS D during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours today and will continue to do so with the project. Because LOS D exceeds the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard, under City policy the significance of the project’s impact is determined through comparison to the permissible change in volume/capacity ratio (v/c ratio). In this case, the...
incremental change resulting from the project is 0.010 in the PM peak hour. Because this value is less than 0.050 increment permitted by the City of Rocklin, the project’s impact to this location is not significant. It is also important to note that the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection is identified under General Plan Circulation Element Policy C-10.B as an exception to the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard.

**Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus Project**

The traffic impacts of the proposed project have also been considered within the context of future traffic conditions in this area of Rocklin assuming other approved but as yet unconstructed projects under an “Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP)” condition. The other approved but as yet unconstructed (or partially constructed) projects that were assumed at the time of this traffic study include: Villages at Civic Center, Racetrack Subdivision, Samoylovich Estates, Los Cerros Subdivision, Rocklin Gateway, Pacific Tech Park, Granite Terrace, Sierra Pine, Brighton Subdivision, Granite at Dominguez Subdivision, Parkland Subdivision, Garnet Creek, Winding Lane Estates, Sunset Hills Townhomes, South Whitney Mixed Use, Gracepoint Adventist Church, Noble Learning Center, Stanford Terrace, Rocklin Adventures, Quick Quack Car Wash, and Sunset at Stanford Ranch Subdivision.
As shown above, with one exception, the City of Rocklin’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard will be maintained under the EPAP and EPAP Plus Project conditions at most study intersections, but LOS D conditions will continue at the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection. The delays at driveway approaches to the Pacific Street/Walmart/Les Schwab mid-block location will lengthen with delays indicative of LOS E and F conditions, however, the City’s Level of Service policy is only applied to formal intersections not driveway approaches. The overall intersection LOS will remain within the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard. Because LOS D at the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection exceeds the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard, under City policy the significance of the project’s impact is determined through comparison to the permissible change in volume/capacity ratio (v/c ratio). In this case, the incremental change resulting from the project is 0.011 in the PM peak hour. Because this value is less that the 0.050 increment permitted by the City of Rocklin, the project’s impact to this location is not significant. It is also important to note that the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection is identified under General Plan Circulation Element Policy C-10.B as an exception to the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard.

**Future (Cumulative Year 2030) Traffic Conditions**

Information from the General Plan EIR has been employed to identify long term traffic conditions in the project vicinity. The table below compares cumulative AM and PM peak hour Levels of Service at study area intersections with and without the proposed project, and also provides a comparison if the project site were to be developed with 100% retail uses.
As shown, four intersections are projected to operate with Levels of Service that do not satisfy the City of Rocklin’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard with and without the project.

**Sunset Boulevard/3rd Street/Springview Drive**

The Sunset Boulevard/3rd Street/Springview Drive intersection is projected to operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour in the cumulative plus project condition. The General Plan anticipated under cumulative conditions that Sunset Boulevard would be widened to provide three through lanes in each direction through the intersection, but this level of improvement would still yield LOS F. The General Plan EIR suggested that possible mitigation to improve LOS at the
intersection would include adding two left turn lanes on eastbound Sunset Boulevard to northbound 3rd Street. This mitigation measure would improve this intersection to LOS D but would still not meet the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard. The General Plan EIR indicated that City staff recommended that this mitigation is feasible but would not result in acceptable LOS. Thus, the intersection is identified under General Plan Circulation Element Policy C-10.B as an exception to the City’s LOS C PM peak hour standard. Because LOS F at the Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive/3rd Street intersection exceeds the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard, under City policy the significance of the project’s impact is determined through comparison to the permissible change in volume/capacity ratio (v/c ratio). In this case, the incremental change resulting from the project is 0.011 in the PM peak hour. Because this value is less that the 0.050 increment permitted by the City of Rocklin, the project’s impact to this location is not significant.

**Sunset Boulevard/Pacific Street**

The Sunset Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection is projected to operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour in the cumulative plus project condition. The General Plan EIR anticipated that Pacific Street would be widened to provide three through lanes on the Pacific Street approaches. The prescribed mitigation would modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes, a shared left-through lane, and a right turn lane on eastbound Sunset Boulevard to improve intersection operations, and the General Plan EIR indicated these improvements would yield LOS C. Because LOS E at the Sunset Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection exceeds the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard, under City policy the significance of the project’s impact is determined through comparison to the permissible change in volume/capacity ratio (v/c ratio). In this case, the incremental change resulting from the project is 0.017 in the PM peak hour. Because this value is less that the 0.050 increment permitted by the City of Rocklin, the project’s impact to this location is not significant.

**Pacific Street/Farron Street**

The Pacific Street/Farron Street intersection is projected to operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour in the cumulative plus project condition. The General Plan EIR prescribed mitigation which would modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes from northbound Pacific Street to westbound Farron Street and add a combined through/left and separate right turn lane with overlap on eastbound Farron Street to improve intersection operations to meet the LOS C standard. Because LOS F at the Pacific Street/Farron Street intersection exceeds the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard, under City policy the significance of the project’s impact is determined through comparison to the permissible change in volume/capacity ratio (v/c ratio). In this case, the incremental change resulting from the project is 0.018 in the PM peak hour. Because this value is less that the 0.050 increment permitted by the City of Rocklin, the project’s impact to this location is not significant.
Pacific Street/Walmart/Les Schwab

One un-signalized location with adjacent private driveway approaches not addressed by the General Plan EIR would operate with an overall LOS that does not meet the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard. The Pacific Street/Walmart/Les Schwab driveway location is projected to operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour in the cumulative plus project condition, however, as previously noted, this un-signalized location is not considered to be a City intersection and therefore is not subject to the City’s LOS policy. While the volume on the side street approaches is not appreciably different from that occurring today, the appreciable increase in the volume of traffic on Pacific Street will result in very long delays for motorists waiting to turn left onto Pacific Street. It is reasonable to assume that under long term cumulative conditions this location would be modified to prohibit left turns onto Pacific Street while allowing left turns into the commercial areas to continue. This prohibition would reduce the length of delay on the side street approaches and result in an overall LOS that satisfies the City’s minimum LOS C PM peak hour standard. This new traffic control would result in the redistribution of vehicles intending to leave the Walmart and travel westerly on Pacific Street. These motorists would likely turn right and make a U-turn at Farron Street. The diverted traffic volume would have an incremental effect on the LOS at the Pacific Street/Farron Street intersection, but the prescribed improvements discussed above would continue to yield a LOS that would meet the minimum City standard. It is also important to note, that operations at this location would have been even more affected had the Quarry Place/Cobblestone portions of the site remained all Retail as previously designated.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Conflict with Program, Plan, Ordinance of Policy Addressing the Circulation System – Less than Significant Impact. As evidenced by the summary of the traffic impact analysis, although increases in delays at study intersections will occur, capacity or level of service impacts from the proposed project are not anticipated.

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 240 multi-family residences would not result in project-specific significant effects as demonstrated by the summary of the project’s traffic impact analysis presented above. 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.” Payment of traffic impact fees as described above will reduce traffic impacts from the proposed project to a less than significant level and the project will not conflict with programs, plans, or ordinances addressing the circulation system nor would it conflict with the City’s Level of Service policy addressing the circulation system.

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
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and collector streets. In the vicinity of the project there are existing Class II bike facilities along Pacific Street and on Sunset Boulevard adjoining the project. The proposed project does not conflict with these 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/Pacific Street, Sunset Boulevard/Springview Drive, and Pacific Street/Farron Street. The project does not conflict with these bus route or stop locations or other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation. 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 and the project will not conflict with programs, plans, ordinances or policies related to transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

The City of Rocklin’s Zoning Ordinance contains off-street parking requirements for different types of development projects. Section 17.66.020 of the Zoning Ordinance notes that for multi-family residences, a minimum of one and a half paved parking spaces for each one-bedroom unit, and two paved parking spaces for each unit with two or more bedrooms, plus twenty-five percent paved visitor parking spaces. At least one parking space per unit shall be covered. The proposed apartment component of the project requires 282 spaces and it is providing 333 spaces. For the retail commercial component of the project, the required parking is 49 spaces per Section 17.66.040, and the project is providing 50 spaces, and for the single family residential component of the project the required parking is 80 spaces (two paved spaces per unit per Section 17.66.100), and the project is providing 80 spaces. Therefore, a parking supply impact is not anticipated.

b. Conflict or Inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program – Less Than Significant Impact. 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 by moving away from the more traditional traffic flow and delay metric of Level of Service (LOS) to an alternative metric known as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). 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). The requirement to incorporate VMT as a metric in CEQA
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documents became effective on December 28, 2018 with the addition of section 15064.3 to the CEQA Guidelines. Per section 15064.3 (c), the provisions of section 15064.3 shall apply statewide, beginning on July 1, 2020. At this time, the City of Rocklin has not yet established a threshold of significance for VMT.

For information and comparison purposes (not analysis purposes), the proposed project is projected to generate approximately 13,186 Vehicle Miles of Travel on a daily basis. There is bus service available along Sunset Boulevard and Pacific Street and bus stops in the project vicinity, so the use of bus service by residents or customers of the project is anticipated. In addition, the Rocklin Multi-modal station (Amtrak train and bus service) is located less than one mile away from the project site, so its use by residents of the project could also occur. Finally, the project is located next to existing retail commercial services including a Walmart grocery store that could be utilized by residents of the project. Collectively, these nearby and convenient elements are anticipated to result in the reduction of the project’s VMT as compared to if the project were not located nearby to those elements.

Because per CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (c) the provisions of section 15064.3 are not in effect until July 1, 2020 and because the City of Rocklin has not yet established a threshold of significance for VMT, the project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b).

c. and d. 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.
## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ a) 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:</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ i) 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ii) 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 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 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 Ione 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 Quarry Place Apartments and Cobblestone Single Family Residential 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 12, 2017, April 18, 2017 and April 13, 2017, respectively. 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 15 and 16, 2017, the end of their 30-day periods. The UAIC contacted the City in a letter received on May 10, 2017 to request AB-52 consultation. City staff met with representatives of the UAIC at the project site on June 26, 2017. The visit focused primarily on the undeveloped portion of the project site behind the former K-Mart building and along Ruhkala Road. A partially buried granite stone and some rock fragments were identified by the UAIC representatives as potential resources indicating previous occupation of the site. City staff questioned whether these stones could be road base or remnants of activity from the nearby quarry and UAIC representatives were unable make a definitive ruling in the field. The UAIC representatives indicated that they believe tribal cultural resources exist in the general area of the project and requested that a mitigation measure be place on the project to protect tribal cultural resources that may be discovered during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure V-1 will reduce impacts the inadvertent discovery of unknown tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005
DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

**Project Impacts:**

The proposed development and occupation of a 40-unit single-family subdivision, 180-unit multi-family subdivision, and 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses 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. and c. Relocation, New or Expanded Utilities – 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.

The proposed project site is located within an area of the City of Rocklin that has been contemplated for urban development in the Rocklin General Plan, and as such the provision of storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas and telecommunications facilities to the project site has been planned for, with much of the necessary distribution infrastructure already in place within existing public utility rights-of-way. The City of Rocklin coordinates with utility and service providers as new development or re-development is being proposed.

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.

The project site is within the Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) service area for electric power and natural gas, and as new development occurs, PG&E builds infrastructure on an as needed basis. Upgrades to existing infrastructure within existing easements (such as roadway right-of-way) are not anticipated to result in significant environmental effects because existing rights-of-way are typically paved or otherwise modified from their original natural condition and would not
contain sensitive environmental resources. New infrastructure, if required in previously undisturbed areas, would be addressed as part of the environmental review for the development of a specific site/project, or would be subject to separate environmental review.

The project site is within the service area for AT&T, CCI Communications, Wave Broadband and various wireless service telecommunications providers. Infrastructure for telephone and cable services is typically installed at the point of initial development and in accordance with service demand. Similar to electric power and natural gas, upgrades to existing telecommunications infrastructure within existing easements (such as roadway right-of-way) are not anticipated to result in significant environmental effects because existing rights-of-way are typically paved or otherwise modified from their original natural condition and would not contain sensitive environmental resources. New infrastructure, if required in previously undisturbed areas, would be addressed as part of the environmental review for the development of a specific site/project, or would be subject to separate environmental review.

Therefore, the project is not anticipated to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects and the impact is less than significant.

b. 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 and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years (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.

d. and e. Solid Waste – 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. 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.

The project does not include any unusual elements that would generate solid waste in excess of State and local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and the project would comply with solid waste regulations and the impact would be less than significant.
### XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:**

**Project Impacts:**

The proposed development and occupation of a 40-unit single-family subdivision, 180-unit multi-family subdivision, and 9,700 sq. ft. +/- of retail commercial uses will increase the need for fire and emergency responses to the project site, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the fire and emergency responders to adequately provide such services.

The Clover Valley area in the northeastern part of Rocklin is identified as a State Responsibility Area (SRA), but the project is not located in or near that SRA. There are no locations in Rocklin that are classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.
Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of wildland fires that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, impairment or interference with implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans and cumulative hazard impacts (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.7-20 through 4.7-28). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in wildland fire and emergency response 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, maintaining emergency operations plans, coordination with emergency management agencies, annexation into financing districts for fire prevention/suppression and emergency response, incorporation of fuel modification/fire hazard reduction planning, and maintaining interjurisdictional cooperation and coordination.

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 wildland fire and emergency response 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. Impair Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan – Less than Significant Impact. The project occurs on a project site that is contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project site does not include any features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The streets adjacent to the project site serve as emergency evacuation corridors and would provide direct fire vehicle access to the site. In addition, the project is evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin’s Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Most wildland fires are caused by human activities involving motor vehicles, construction/maintenance equipment, arson and burning of debris. The addition of impervious surface cover on the mostly developed site may in fact help reduce the potential fire risk. Therefore, the project will not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan and the impact will be less than significant.
b. and c. Exacerbation of Fire Risk – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project occurs on a project site that is contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project site does not occur in an area where an exacerbation of fire risk would occur due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The project is required to install new fire hydrants and the project will include underground power lines which will reduce the potential for overhead powerline fires. In addition, construction of roadway improvements and other impervious surface areas, as well as upgrades to existing infrastructure would help reduce fire risk. Therefore, the project will not exacerbate wildfire risk and the impact will be less than significant.

d. Exposure of People or Structures to Risk – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is relatively flat and located in an urban area where there would be no downslope or downstream flooding or landslides that would result from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risks and the impact will be less than significant.
## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 proposed project site is previously developed and is mostly surrounded by developed land. Based on the project location and the application of mitigation measures for potential biological resources and cultural resources 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 will 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 proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. Development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the proposed 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. In addition, the project-specific air quality analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impact. 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 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 proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impacts. Development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the proposed project represents less vehicle trip generation than that which was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. In addition, the project-specific noise analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative noise impact. 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 proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the proposed 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 Impact. Because the development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the proposed 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.
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MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
QUARRY PLACE APARTMENTS, QUARRY PLACE RETAIL
AND COBBLESTONE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
(DR2017-0001, DR2019-0007, TRE2019-0004 and SD2017-0005)

Project Name and Description
The Quarry Place Apartments, Quarry Place Retail and Cobblestone Single Family Residential project proposes the construction of a multi-family apartment complex consisting of 180 multi-family residential units, two commercial structures, and a single family residential subdivision consisting of 40 lots on an approximately 15.22 +/- acre site in the City of Rocklin. This project will require Design Review, Oak Tree Preservation Plan and Tentative Subdivision Map entitlements. The project site was previously graded for retail commercial lots and portions of the site are currently developed with retail commercial uses. 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 northeastern corner of Pacific Street and Sunset Boulevard in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers are 010-470-003, -008, -021, -022, -023, -024, and -026.

Project Proponent’s Name
The applicant and property owner is St. Anton Communities.

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: July 26, 2019

Date Adopted: 

Signature: David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Department Director
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: Economic and Community Development (ECDD), 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:
MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources:

To address the potential impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, the following mitigation measure 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 grading/construction activities occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February 1 – September 15), the City and/or contractor shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of grading/construction 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. Prior to the start of grading/construction activities, documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City of Rocklin Community Development Department and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary structure removal may proceed. If there is a break in grading/construction activities 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 grading/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.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project’s Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

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 Economic and 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
MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources:

To ensure compliance with the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and to compensate for the removal of the oak trees on the project site, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-2 a) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant/developer shall submit a grading plan with a list of all existing on- and off-site oak tree(s) and standard notes to ensure the protection of the off-site oak tree(s) that are designated to remain. The grading plan shall be review and approved by the Community Development Director and the City Engineer to ensure that oak trees not scheduled for removal will be protected from construction activities in compliance with the pertinent sections of the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

b) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant/developer shall retain a certified arborist to review the design of the project improvements and recommend measures to protect oak trees that are designated to remain, both during construction and afterwards. These measures shall be incorporated into the project’s grading and/or improvement plans, for review and approval by the City Engineer. The protection measures shall include appropriate fencing around those trees to remain. The protection measures shall be approved prior to the issuance of improvement plans or a grading permit for all or any portion of the project.

c) Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant shall retain a certified arborist to prepare and implement an inspection plan for review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer which provides for the periodic inspection of the site during grading and construction activities. During grading and construction activities, the certified arborist shall provide documentation to the City Engineer that the approved protection measures have been properly implemented and are being maintained.

d) Upon completion of the project and prior to the first building’s final inspection/issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project arborist shall prepare a report to verify the on- and off-site oak tree(s) that were designated to remain have not been negatively impacted by construction of the project. If the project has negatively impacted any on- and/or off-site oak tree(s), then prior to a final inspection/issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first building, the developer shall mitigate for all oak trees removed as a result of the project consistent with the requirements of the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code Section 17.77.080.B). The required mitigation shall be calculated using the formula provided in the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and to that end the project arborist shall provide the following information:

- The total number of surveyed oak trees;
• The total number of oak trees to be removed;
• The total number of oak trees to be removed that are to be removed because they are sick or dying, and
• The total, in inches, of the trunk diameters at breast height (TDBH) of all surveyed oak trees on the site in each of these categories.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project’s Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to any grading or construction activity, the applicant/developer shall prepare, subject to approval by the City’s Community Development Director, an oak tree mitigation plan which incorporates the steps noted above, including payment of necessary fees into the City’s Oak Tree Mitigation Fund.

RESPONSIBILITY
Applicant/Developer
City of Rocklin Community Development Department
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 measures are 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 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 Public Services Department (Environmental Services Manager)
City of Rocklin Community Development Department
Native American Heritage Commission
MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT FORMS

Project Title:

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 B – PROJECT SITE PLAN