

SECTION 5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Page 5.0-5, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

In addition, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with cumulative land use effects beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-7, the second complete paragraph is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with contributions to regional air quality impacts beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-8, the third paragraph under Impact 4.3.5 (Cumulative Impacts to Scenic Vista, Scenic Resources, Existing Visual Character and Creation of Light and Glare) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan would not result in impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, existing visual character, and creation of light and glare impacts beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. ~~However, implementation of the CAP could add to the significant and unavoidable visual and glare impacts of the proposed General Plan Update.~~

Page 5.0-27, the third paragraph under Impact 4.5.6 (Cumulative Transportation Noise Impacts within the Planning Area) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with transportation noise beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-28, the third paragraph under Impact 4.5.7 (Cumulative Transportation Noise Impacts on Adjacent Jurisdictions) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor the CAP~~ would not result in impacts on adjacent jurisdictions associated with transportation noise beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-30, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-31, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increase of erosion and loss of topsoil beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-33, the first paragraph is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with hazardous materials and human health risks beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-33, the second paragraph under Impact 4.8.4 (Cumulative Impacts on Historic Resources, Prehistoric Resources, and Human Remains) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts on historic resources, prehistoric resources, and human remains beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-34, the second paragraph under Impact 4.8.5 (Cumulative Impacts to Historic Character) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts to historic character beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-36, the third paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with water quality beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-37, the third paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with flood hazards beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-38, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan would not result in impacts to special-status species, impacts to species of special concern and other non-listed special-status species, impacts to sensitive biological communities, impacts to migratory corridors, loss of native oak and heritage trees, and loss of oak woodland habitat beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. ~~However, implementation of the CAP could add to the potential for impacts to sensitive and special-status species, to species of concern and other non-listed special-status species, to sensitive biological communities, and to migratory corridors. While these impacts can be substantial for large-scale (e.g., 100 acres and greater) wind turbine and solar facilities, such substantial impacts would not be anticipated to occur given the existing developed and entitled land use condition of the city and the resulting lack of large-scale areas for alternative energy uses.~~

Page 5.0-40, the first complete paragraph is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increases in population and housing beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-41, the third paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services or adequate fire flow beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-42, the third paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for law enforcement services beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-43, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for public schools or post-secondary education facilities what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-44, the second paragraph under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for parks and recreation facilities beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-45, the fourth paragraph under Impact 4.13.1.3 (Cumulative Demand for Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-46, the second paragraph under Impact 4.13.2.2 (Cumulative Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for solid waste services beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-48, the first complete paragraph is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-49, the third paragraph under Impact 4.14.3 (Cumulative Impacts to Water Supply and Related Infrastructure) is modified as follows:

As previously discussed, ~~neither~~ the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan ~~nor~~ ~~the CAP~~ would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for water supply and related infrastructure beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Page 5.0-50, the first sentence in the impact statement for Impact 4.15.1 (Consistency with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures) is modified as follows:

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update ~~and the Climate Action Plan~~ would implement a number of policies and activities as well as continue the implementation of existing City programs that would complement and be consistent with the early emission reduction strategies contained in the AB 32 Scoping Plan Report to the Governor ~~and Executive Order S-3-05~~ as well as the recommendations from OPR.

Page 5.0-50, the first paragraph under Impact 4.15.1 (Consistency with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures) is modified as follows:

Table 4.15-2 identifies major GHG emissions per service population under a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario ~~(General Plan Update without CAP implementation)~~. **Table 4.15-2** includes GHG emissions per service population for the years 2008 (current levels), 2020, and 2030. It should be noted that these are emissions from major sources and do not factor into smaller GHG emission sources (e.g., miscellaneous maintenance operations in the city such as landscape maintenance and construction activities) and other inventory limitations as discussed above as well as GHG reduction measures currently and planned to be employed by the City.

Pages 5.0-50, 5.0-51 and 5.0-52, the text beginning at the third paragraph under Impact 4.15.1 (Consistency with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures) is modified as follows:

The City of Rocklin is committed to reducing GHG emissions as development occurs by addressing GHG emissions on a project-by-project basis through the CEQA review process. As a part of such commitment, the City has identified General Plan policies from the California Air Pollution Control Officers (CAPCOA) *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans* document (June 2009) for inclusion into the Rocklin General Plan Update. These goals and policies are in addition to the policies identified below under the heading “Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation” that collectively would help reduce the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions. ~~developed strategies to meet its reduction targets. The City has set emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2030 that would result in a significant reduction from business as usual (unmitigated) General Plan Update emissions growth, consistent with the direction of AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05. The strategies identified in the City’s CAP combined with emissions reductions from state programs would achieve a CO₂e per service population reduction of 33.4 percent by 2020 and a 51.3 percent reduction in CO₂e by 2030 compared with business as usual, as shown in **Table 4.15-3.**~~

~~CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 describes the necessary elements of a greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategy for a local jurisdiction. The discussion below outlines how~~

the City complies with each of the individual criteria listed in the guidelines through the City's Climate Action Plan reduction strategies.

- ~~The City of Rocklin has quantified existing and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 describes the necessary elements of a greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategy for a local jurisdiction. The discussion below outlines how the City complies with each of the individual criteria listed in the guidelines through the City's Climate Action Plan reduction strategies.~~
- ~~The City of Rocklin has quantified existing and proposed greenhouse gas emissions throughout the community, including regional and state programs as appropriate. These quantifications used standard industry methodologies, where available, to support the conclusion in this plan that the City of Rocklin can meet its proposed reduction targets.~~
- ~~The City of Rocklin has adopted targets for emissions reductions as a part of its Climate Action Plan, consistent with the direction provided by the AB 32 Scoping Plan and Executive Order S-03-05. The Climate Action Plan will be evaluated on a regular basis to ensure target compliance is proceeding at a pace necessary to meet the targets of 2020 and 2030.~~
- ~~The Climate Action Plan thoroughly analyzes emissions from the City of Rocklin's community operations, consistent with standard industry protocol at the time of its development.~~
- ~~Measures proposed in the Climate Action Plan include those that are anticipated to significantly reduce emissions from the community. All measures were quantified using standard industry practice at the time of Climate Action Plan development, where available, to ensure that the stated reductions are supported by substantial evidence. Minor emissions reduction measures, including the City operational measures that do not significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, were not included. Reduction measures come from five primary sources:~~
 - ~~1. City of Rocklin General Plan policies~~
 - ~~2. City of Rocklin Climate Action Plan reduction measures~~
 - ~~3. City of Rocklin programs and actions currently being implemented~~
 - ~~4. Regional programs and policies in which the City participates~~
 - ~~5. Applicable California State policies and programs~~
- ~~The City of Rocklin has developed a Microsoft Excel-based monitoring and implementation tool to allow the City to track emissions over time and modify or replace emissions reduction measures that are not performing as anticipated.~~
- ~~The greenhouse gas reduction strategies that are a part of the Climate Action Plan were developed in coordination with the City's General Plan Update efforts and General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and are fully included in the analysis associated with the City's General Plan EIR.~~

~~Through completion of the above criteria, the City has demonstrated that the greenhouse gas reduction strategies within its Climate Action Plan are consistent with the guidance set forth by CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5.~~

~~As shown in Table 4.15.3, the City of Rocklin would achieve (and exceed) the GHG targets of 15 percent below current (2005-2008) per service population levels by 2020 and 42 percent by 2030 and is therefore consistent with AB 32.~~

In addition to the General Plan Update policies for GHG emissions discussed above and noted below, the following citywide programs and policies also contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions:

Page 5.0-56, the first paragraph is modified as follows:

As discussed identified above, future development in the City and the resultant generation of GHG emissions implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be addressed on a project-by-project basis through the CEQA review process; through these efforts, implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan would be consistent with state measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The City's General Plan Update will be consistent with AB 32, and this impact is less than cumulatively considerable.

Page 5.0-56, the second paragraph is deleted as follows:

~~As part of the proposed project, the City plans to amend the Redevelopment Plan to increase tax increment limitations, increase the limit on the principal amount of bonded indebtedness secured by tax increment revenue, and extend the time limit for the commencement of eminent domain proceedings to acquire non-residential property. These amendments are intended to provide the City's Redevelopment Agency with the financial and administrative resources necessary to continue assisting projects that implement its program of blight elimination within the Redevelopment Project Area. While the extended time and financial limits authorized by the Sixth Amendment may foster and encourage new development that might not occur without the Sixth Amendment, or may occur faster than had the Sixth Amendment not been adopted, all development would be consistent with the City's General Plan and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this DEIR. Any future development resulting from amending the Redevelopment Plan would occur in areas designated for such development by the General Plan as the land uses permitted by the Redevelopment Plan are allowable uses under the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan would not result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.~~

Page 5.0-57, the first paragraph under Impact 4.15.3 is modified as follows:

As discussed above in Impact 4.15.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan Update would generate GHG emissions that would predominantly consist of CO₂. While emissions of other GHGs, such as methane, are important with respect to global climate change, emission levels of other GHGs are less dependent on the land use and circulation patterns associated with the proposed General Plan Update than are levels of CO₂. The City has been proactively undertaking current efforts and is also proposing a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and General Plan Update policies and project-by-project evaluation of GHG emissions through the CEQA review process to ~~be~~ ensure consistency with the early emission reduction strategies contained in the AB 32 Scoping Plan Report to the Governor ~~and Executive Order S-3-05~~ as well as recommendations from OPR. While it is acknowledged in Impact 4.15.1 that the City of Rocklin is committed to reducing GHG emissions ~~and has developed strategies to meet its reduction targets~~ so that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update ~~and Climate Action Plan~~ would be consistent with state measures to reduce GHG emissions, it must also be acknowledged that continued development under the proposed General Plan Update will still generate GHG emissions. Therefore, buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the generation of GHG emissions which are **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.**

Page 5.0-58, the first paragraph is deleted as follows:

~~In addition, as discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and under Impact 4.15.1 above, the project includes the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan and the CAP, both of which would be consistent with the proposed General Plan Update and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this DEIR. As these project components would not result in land use activities or population growth beyond what is identified in the General Plan Update, they would not result in impacts associated with increased demand for water service infrastructure beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.~~

SECTION 6.0 ALTERNATIVES

Page 6.0-2, the eleventh bullet and the associated text is deleted as follows:

- ~~• Adopt and implement a climate action plan, consistent with the target reductions of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and the AB 32 Scoping Plan, to reduce emissions from activities over which the City has jurisdiction and operational control.~~