

**EXHIBIT B
QUARRY ROW SUBDIVISION FINDINGS OF FACT
AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

CITY OF ROCKLIN

**CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT
AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

FOR THE

QUARRY ROW SUBDIVISION PROJECT

(SCH# 2017032029)

December 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Acronym and Abbreviations 1

III. Project Description..... 3

 A. Location..... 3

 B. Overview 4

 C. Project Objectives..... 5

 D. Discretionary Approvals..... 5

IV. Environmental Review Process 6

 A. Less-Than-Significant Impacts..... 6

 B. Potentially Significant Impacts 13

 C. Notice of Preparation 13

 D. Draft EIR..... 13

 E. Final EIR..... 14

 F. Certification of the Final EIR 14

V. Record of Proceedings 14

 A. Custodian of Record 14

 B. Preparation and Consideration of the FEIR and Independent Judgment Findings 16

VI. Consistency with Applicable Plans..... 16

VII. Findings Required Under CEQA 17

VIII. Certifications..... 19

IX. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program 20

X. Less-Than-Significant or No Impacts 20

 1. Aesthetics..... 20

 2. Agricultural Resources..... 20

 3. Air Quality..... 21

 4. Biological Resources 21

 5. Geology and Soils..... 22

 6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 22

 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... 22

 8. Hydrology and Water Quality 23

 9. Land Use and Planning 24

 10. Mineral Resources..... 24

 11. Noise 24

12. Population and Housing.....	25
13. Public Services	25
14. Recreation	25
15. Transportation, Traffic.....	25
16. Utilities and Service Systems.....	26
17. Energy	26
18. Growth-Inducement	28
19. Significant and Irreversible Effects.....	29
XI. Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures.....	30
A. Cultural Resources	31
XII. Cumulative Impacts	35
A. Cultural Resources	36
B. Other Cumulative Analyses	39
XIII. Significant And Unavoidable Impacts.....	39
XIV. Findings Related to Project Alternatives.....	39
A. Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Analysis.....	40
B. Alternatives to the Project	41
Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	41
Alternative 2: No Project/No Action	42
Alternative 3: Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density	44
Alternative 4: Reduced Density With Similar Footprint	46
Environmentally Superior Alternative	48
XV. Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	48
XVI. Conclusion.....	54

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Rocklin (“City”), as lead agency, prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR” or “DEIR”) for the Quarry Row Subdivision (“Project”). In its entirety, the documents consist of the December 2017 Draft EIR and the March 2020 Final EIR (“FEIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2017032029). Where referenced in this document, the FEIR consists of both the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Reports (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15132, 15362, subd. (b)). As described in the FEIR, the Project is a land development proposal for 74 single-family homes on approximately 7.4 acres, of which ten percent (7-8 units) would be set aside for low-income buyers. The project includes a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, General Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Map, Design Review, and Oak Tree Reservation Plan Permit. These findings, as well as the accompanying statement of overriding considerations, have been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code, Sec. 21000 et seq) and its implementing guidelines (“CEQA Guidelines”)(Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, Sec 15000 et seq).

II. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

These Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Findings) contain a number of acronyms and abbreviations, which are defined below.

AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
AMI	Area median income
APN	Assessor’s Parcel Number
BAT	Best Available Technology
BAU	Business as Usual
BCI	Bat Conservation International
BMPs	Best management practices
C-2	Retail Business
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
Caltrans	State of California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH ₄	Methane
CIP	Capital Improvement Plan
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Data Base
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ E	CO ₂ equivalents
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CVRWQCB	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
dB	Decibel

DBA	A-weighted decibel
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPAP	Existing Plus Approved Projects
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
GHG	Greenhouse gasses
HABS	Historic American Building Survey
HDR	High Density Residential
I-80	Interstate 80
IBMI	Ione Band of Miwok Indians
ITE	Institute of Traffic Engineers
kBTU	Thousand British thermal units
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
L _{dn}	Day/Night Average Sound Level
L _{eq}	Equivalent sound level
LID	Low impact development
LOS	Level of service
Mgd	Millions of gallons per day
MHDR	Medium High Density Residential
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Mph	Miles per hour
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
MTCO ₂ e	Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalents
MU	Mixed Use
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
National Register	National Register of Historic Places
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NF3	Nitrogen trifluoride
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	Nitrogen oxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PCWA	Placer County Water Agency
PD-9	Planned Development, 9 units per acre

PD-10.5	Planned Development, 10.5 units per acre
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PM	Particulate matter
PM2.5	Particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less
PM ₁₀	Particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less
PRC	Public Resources Code
RACM	Reasonably Available Control Measures
ROG	Reactive organic gases
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RUSD	Rocklin Unified School District
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SF ₆	Sulfur hexafluoride
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SPRTA	South Placer Regional Transportation Authority
SPMUD	South Placer Municipal Utilities District
SPWA	South Placer Wastewater Authority
STC	Sound Transmission Class
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Toxic air contaminant
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TIM	Traffic impact mitigation
TMDCI	Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	Underground storage tank
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. LOCATION

The project site is located in the City of Rocklin in Placer County (see Figure 3-1, Regional Location, DEIR p. 3-2). The project site is located in the eastern portion of the City on the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Pacific Street and Grove Street, at 4545 Pacific Street (see Figure 3-2, DEIR p. 3-3). The project site contains approximately 7.4 acres, and is comprised of six parcels, Placer

County Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 045-031-001 through -004, 045-031-005-510, and 045-031-047.

The surrounding area is developed primarily with light industrial, retail commercial and residential uses (see Figure 3-3, Project Site, DEIR p. 3-4). To the north of the project site are Pacific Street, Yankee Hill Road and light industrial and retail commercial uses. To the east of the project site are single-family residences along Jamerson Drive and Winners Circle and several retail commercial uses along Pacific Street. To the south of the project site are single-family residences along Tuttle Drive, and to the west of the project site are Grove Street, a mobile home park and several retail commercial uses along Pacific Street.

B. OVERVIEW

The Quarry Row Subdivision project (Project) consists of the demolition of an existing commercial structure and the development of a 74-unit, single-family residential subdivision. Minimum lot sizes would be 28 feet by 70 feet for a total minimum lot area of 1,960 square feet, with the maximum lot size being 4,251 square feet, and an average lot size of 2,264 square feet. The vehicular entrance to each lot would be from an alley at the rear of the home. The alley would be loaded on both sides with home sites, and occupants would share the alley for access to their respective two car garages.

Access to the subdivision would be from Pacific Street and Grove Street.

The original proposed site plan consisting of 64 units is shown in Figure 3-4 of the DEIR (p. 3-6), and the updated proposed site plan consisting of 74 units is shown in Revised Figure 3-4 of the FEIR (p. 2-5).

Each residence is proposed to be two stories. Architectural styles would consist of Farmhouse, Bungalow and Craftsman.

The Project would change the General Plan land use designation to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and the zoning designation to Planned Development Residential, 10.5 dwelling units per acre (PD-10.5).

Ten percent of the dwelling units (7-8 units) will be set aside for low-income buyers, defined as those with a household income of 80% of the area median income (AMI).

The Project would provide several small open space areas along Pacific Street and in the southeast corner of the site.

The Project would require the modification of an existing center median landscape island on Pacific Street to provide access to the site and minor extensions of utility lines (e.g., water, sewer, electrical) to connect to existing facilities.

C. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The stated objectives of this Project are as follows:

- Make efficient use of an under-utilized infill parcel;
- Maximize development on a parcel with minimal natural resources;
- Develop housing in proximity to and compatible with other residential development;
- Provide housing opportunities consistent with General Plan Land Use policies encouraging a variety of residential densities, infill and the location of Medium- High and High Density residential development near major arterial and collector streets;
- Develop a high-quality, viable project that responds to market conditions;
- Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion;
- Develop an economically viable project that can fund infrastructure and public services needed to meet the demand of future project residents without adversely affecting existing residents;
- Provide a project that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, including its guiding principles and strategies as they relate to smart land use, access and mobility and compact development; and
- Create and maintain a permanent record of historical features and associated events that contribute to the historical significance of the Pleasure Hall/Stardust Skating Rink.
- Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households.

D. DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

The following discretionary and non-discretionary actions would be taken by the City in order to approve the Project:

- Certification of the EIR;
- CEQA Findings – the appropriate findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations, if necessary, must be adopted by the City in conjunction with the certification of the EIR. This document satisfies that requirement.
- Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan;
- General Plan Amendment to re-designate the project site's General Plan land use designations of Mixed Use (MU) and High Density Residential (HDR) to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR);

- Rezone from Retail Business (C-2) to Planned Development Residential, 10.5 dwelling units per acre (PD-10.5);
- General Development Plan to establish allowed land uses and development standards for PD-10.5 zoning district;
- Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide the six existing parcels into 74 lots;
- Design Review;
- Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit;
- City of Rocklin Engineering Division approval of Improvement Plans; and
- City of Rocklin Building Division issuance of Building Permits.

Other Agency Actions

The term “responsible agency” includes all public agencies other than the lead agency that may have discretionary approvals associated with the implementation of some aspect of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15381). In order to carry out the Project, these responsible agencies would need to take the following actions:

- Placer County Water Agency: will serve letter and review and approval of construction of water facilities;
- South Placer Municipal Utility District: will serve letter and review and approval of construction of sewer facilities; and
- Placer County Air Pollution Control District: approval of dust control plan.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT OR NO IMPACTS

The proposed Quarry Row project was reviewed in an Initial Study (DEIR, Appendix A, Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study) in accordance with the significance criteria developed by the City of Rocklin based on criteria presented in Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form”, of the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study was used to determine the potential project-related impacts for each of the topics listed in the Environmental Checklist. These significance criteria were used to determine whether the Project would have “no impact”, or if Project impacts would be “less than significant”, “less than significant with mitigation”, or “potentially significant”. The DEIR then addresses only those issue areas for which the Initial Study found that the Project could cause a potentially significant impact. All other impacts that were analyzed and determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study were not addressed further in the DEIR.

The Initial Study found that impacts in the following issue areas would be less than significant and/or that no impact would occur in these areas:

- Aesthetics,

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources,
- Air Quality,
- Geology and Soils,
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions,
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials,
- Hydrology and Water Quality,
- Land Use and Planning,
- Mineral Resources,
- Population and Housing,
- Public Services,
- Recreation,
- Transportation/Traffic,
- Tribal Cultural Resources, and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

The Initial Study found that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study:

- Biological Resources, and
- Noise.

A summary of the findings of the Initial Study for each issue area is provided below (DEIR, p. 2-2 through 2-5 and DEIR Appendix A). Note that when the Initial Study was prepared, the Project included only 64 single-family homes. After circulation of the DEIR, the Project was redesigned to include 74 single-family homes (see FEIR Chapter 2).

Aesthetics – The alteration of the project site through the demolition of one commercial structure and the construction of single family homes would not introduce incompatible elements in an area that is currently developed with residential, commercial and light industrial uses. The structures that are anticipated are of consistent height and scale with existing surrounding development and future anticipated development. There are no unusual characteristics of the project that would introduce incompatible elements or create unusual light and glare. The form, height, massing and character of the homes would be subject to the requirements of the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Design Review Guidelines, which would ensure that the visual character of the Project is compatible with surrounding development. For these reasons, aesthetic impacts from the Project would be less than significant.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources – The project site is not prime farmland, agricultural land or forestry lands, so the Project would not cause impacts on these resources.

Air Quality – An air quality analysis concluded that short-term construction-related emissions and long-term operational and cumulative emissions would not exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District’s (PCAPCD) significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and CO and thus the Project would not contribute to the PCAPCD’s nonattainment status of ozone and particulate matter (PM). Operations of the Project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to

an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, construction-related, operation-related and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. The analysis also concluded that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations and the project would not create objectionable odors. Overall, air quality impacts from the Project were determined to be less than significant.

Biological Resources – A wetland determination and a biological resources evaluation were prepared for the Project. The reports concluded that, due to the developed and disturbed nature of the project site, there are no sensitive habitats or wetlands that would be affected by the Project. Nesting birds and roosting bats could be disturbed by project construction, so mitigation is provided to protect these species (Mitigation Measure IV-1, below). The project site also contains five native oak trees that would require removal, so the Initial Study identified a mitigation measure to ensure compliance with the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and to compensate for the removal of the oak trees. Implementation of the project-specific Mitigation Measure IV.-2, below, would reduce impacts related to oak tree removal to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure IV.-1

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

If tree and vegetation removal would occur during the nesting season for raptors and/or migratory birds (February-September 15), the developer 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 demolition 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 removal activities, documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City of Rocklin Building 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 demolition activity of more than 14 days, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

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

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

- (b) Prior to removal of the existing building, a survey for bats shall be prepared by a

qualified biologist. If bat roosting sites are identified within the survey area, then they shall be avoided during the nursery season (April 1st through August 31st). The bats may be evicted from the building between September 1 and March 31, which is outside of the nursery season. Eviction of bats shall be conducted using bat exclusion techniques, developed by Bat Conservation International (BCI) and in consultation with the CDFW, that allow the bats to exit the roosting site but prevent re-entry to the site. This would include, but not be limited to the installation of one way exclusion devices. The devices shall remain in place for a minimum of seven days and then the exclusion points and any other potential entrances shall be sealed immediately following the removal of the devices. This work shall be completed by a BCI recommended exclusion professional.

Mitigation Measure IV.-2

Prior to the issuance of improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant shall:

- (a) Clearly indicate on the construction documents 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) Mitigate for the removal of oak trees on the project site 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.

Geology and Soils – Grading, trenching and backfilling associated with the construction of the Project would alter the topography on the project site and could result in soil erosion impacts. Compliance with the City's development review process, the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and the Uniform Building Code would reduce any potential geology and soils impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Construction and operation of the Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions. The CalEEMod software modeling program was used to estimate the Project's short-term construction related and long-term operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The analysis concluded that the Project's greenhouse gas emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Construction and operation of a single-family residential project are not anticipated to involve the transportation, use and disposal of large amounts of hazardous materials. Compliance with the 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.

Hydrology and Water Quality - The Project would involve grading activities that would remove vegetation and expose soil to wind and water erosion, which could adversely affect water quality if runoff entered local drainages. Additional impervious surfaces would be created with the development of the Project, which would increase the amount of urban runoff. Waterways in the Rocklin area have the potential to flood and expose people or structures to flooding. According to FEMA flood maps (Map Panel 06061CO961H, effective date November 2, 2018) the project site is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard, which indicates that the Project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and is outside of the 500-year flood hazard area. Compliance with the Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, the City's 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 City's Improvement Standards would reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality to a less-than-significant level.

Land Use and Planning – The project site is designated Mixed Use (MU) and High Density Residential (HDR) on the City of Rocklin General Plan land use map and is zoned Retail Business (C-2). The Project requires a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, General Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Map, Design Review and Oak Tree Preservation Plan from the City of Rocklin. Approval of such entitlements and compliance with the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with City planning documents. Therefore, the impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Mineral Resources - The City of Rocklin planning area and the project site have no mineral resources as classified by the State Geologist. The project site has no known or suspected mineral resources that would be of value to the region or to residents of the state. Therefore, no mineral resources impact is anticipated.

Noise - Development of the Project would result in an increase in short-term noise impacts from construction activities, but through compliance with the City's standard conditions, the impact would be less than significant. The development and occupation of a residential subdivision is not anticipated to have significant long-term operational noise impacts. A noise assessment for the Project found that roadway noise levels could exceed interior noise level standards for future residents of some project homes. The Initial Study identified Mitigation Measure XII.-1, below, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Compliance with this measure, General Plan noise policies and the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines would reduce noise related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure XII.-1

All windows or glass doors with a view of Pacific Street shall be fitted with Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating 35 minimum rated assemblies. This would apply specifically to the first row of units closest to Pacific Street, including facades with a perpendicular view of Pacific Street. This conclusion assumes the use of a 3-coat stucco building construction and carpeted room. As an alternative to this blanket requirement, a detailed analysis of interior noise control measures may be conducted when project building plans and flooring types are available. The detailed analysis shall outline specific window, door, and building façade noise control measures utilized to achieve compliance with the 45 dB L_{dn} interior noise level standard.

Mitigation Measure XII.-2

Air conditioning or mechanical ventilation shall be provided for all residences constructed within this development to allow occupants to keep doors and windows closed for acoustical isolation.

Mitigation Measure XII.-3

Mechanical ventilation penetrations for bath fans shall not face towards Pacific Street. Where feasible these vents shall be routed towards the opposite side of the building (away from Pacific Street) to minimize sound intrusion to sensitive areas of the building. Where vents must face towards Pacific Street, the duct work shall be increased in length and make as many "S" turns as feasible prior to exiting the dwelling. Flexible duct work is the preferred ducting for this noise mitigation. Where the vents exit the building, a spring loaded flap with a gasket shall be installed to reduce sound entering the duct work when the vent is not in use.

Population and Housing - The project site has long been identified for development of urban uses in the City of Rocklin General Plan and as proposed would provide future housing opportunities, but not to such a degree that it would induce substantial population growth. The project site is mostly vacant and development would not displace any homes or residents. The Project would therefore have a less than significant impact on population and housing.

Public Services - The Project would increase demand for increased public services because an undeveloped site would become developed. Compliance with General Plan goals and policies and payment of necessary fees, including participation in any applicable financing district and applicable development impact fees, would ensure that these services would be available for the Project without reducing service levels for existing development. No new facilities (e.g., fire stations) would be needed to serve the Project. For these reasons, the impact on public services would be less than significant.

Recreation - The Project would result in additional residents that would be expected to use City of Rocklin and other recreational facilities. However, compliance with General Plan goals and

policies and payment of necessary fees, including park and recreation fees, would ensure the impacts to recreational facilities are less than significant.

Transportation and Traffic - The Project is anticipated to cause increases in traffic because a partly developed site would become further developed with a 74 lot single-family residential subdivision whose residents would generate automobile trips. A traffic study prepared for the Project concluded that the addition of project traffic would not cause any of the study locations to exceed the City's Level of Service policy during the PM peak hour under the existing plus project, existing plus approved projects plus project, or cumulative plus project analysis scenarios. The Project would not conflict with existing bike lane locations, sidewalks or with other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation. Therefore, the Project would have less-than-significant transportation and traffic impacts.

Tribal Cultural Resources - 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. The City has complied with the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52, Gatto 2014) by consulting with the United Auburn Indian Community, Ione Band of Miwok Indians and the Torres Desert Cahuilla Indians and none of those tribes submitted a formal request for consultation on the project. Therefore, the Project would have less-than-significant tribal cultural resources impacts.

Utilities and Service Systems – The Project would increase the need for utility and service systems because the partly developed site would become further developed. Such increases are not anticipated to affect the ability of the utility and service providers to adequately provide such services because the project site is within the existing service areas of utility and service systems providers and the project site has long been identified for development of urban uses in the City of Rocklin General Plan. Further, the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) and Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) have provided letters to the City indicating that the project is within their respective service areas and eligible for service upon compliance with their standard requirements and payment of applicable fees. Compliance with General Plan goals and policies and service provider requirements and payment of necessary fees would ensure the impacts to utilities and service systems are less than significant.

The project applicant has agreed to implement the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study.

Documentation to support the exclusion of these topics from further consideration in the DEIR is provided in the Initial Study, the appendices to the DEIR, the FEIR and the appendices to the FEIR.

B. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The Initial Study found that the Project would have potential impacts on cultural resources, including impacts on archaeological resources, historic buildings and paleontological resources. A cultural resources assessment of the project site was prepared by Windmiller, Supernowicz and Finger (July 2015). The assessment concluded that the existing commercial structure on the

project site is the historic Pleasure Hall/Stardust Skating Rink building at 4545 Pacific Street. The building is identified in the 2011 City of Rocklin General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report as a property of local historical interest. An assessment of the building during the present study concluded that it is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1 for its association with the history of social-cultural events, recreation and entertainment in Rocklin and Placer County. Its period of significance begins in the 1930s during the Great Depression, extends through World War II and culminates in the period of the baby-boom generation of the 1950s and 1960s. The demolition of this building could have a significant impact on historic resources.

Grading of the project site could also affect subsurface archaeological resources and/or paleontological resources (e.g., fossils), if such resources are present.

These potential cultural resource impacts are addressed in Section 4.1 of the DEIR.

C. NOTICE OF PREPARATION

In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project on March 9, 2017, for a 30-day review period ending April 10, 2017. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15023, subdivision (c), and 15087, subdivision (f), the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research is responsible for distributing environmental documents to State agencies, departments, boards, and commissions for review and comment. The City followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The State Clearinghouse was obligated to make, and did make, that information available to interested agencies for review and comment. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (SCH#2017032029) on March 9, 2016, and was made available for a 30-day public review period ending on April 10, 2016. The City also held a public scoping meeting on April 5, 2016, to receive comments on the NOP and discuss the scope of the DEIR. The NOP and the comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively, of the DEIR. Summaries of the comments received at the scoping meeting as well as the comments received on the NOP, are included on pages 1-3 and 1-4 of the DEIR, and responses to those comments are presented on pages 1-4 through 1-13 of the DEIR.

D. DRAFT EIR

Consistent with the conclusions of the Initial Study, the following environmental issues were addressed in the EIR:

- Cultural Resources, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources.

The City distributed the DEIR for public and agency review on December 14, 2017. A public review period of 45 days was provided on the DEIR, ending on January 29, 2018 (DEIR Notice of Availability, p. 1). This period satisfied the requirement of a 45-day review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines.

E. FINAL EIR

The Final EIR was issued in December 2020. The FEIR includes comments received related to the DEIR, responses to significant environmental issues raised in the comments, revisions to the text of the DEIR as necessary for clarification and to address changes to the Project, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

F. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

On December 15, 2020, the Planning Commission for the City of Rocklin held a public hearing on the Project and FEIR. At the conclusion of the hearing the Planning Commission adopted resolutions recommending certification of the FEIR as adequate and complete and recommending approval of the Project. On January 26, 2021, the City Council for the City of Rocklin held a public hearing on the Project and FEIR. At the conclusion of the hearing, the City Council adopted resolutions (1) certifying of the FEIR as adequate and complete and (2) approving the Project. To support such approval, the City Council makes the following findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations (collectively the "Findings"). These Findings contain the Council's written analysis and conclusions regarding the Project's environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives to the Project. These Findings are based upon the entire record of proceedings for the FEIR, as described below.

V. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

A. CUSTODIAN OF RECORD

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the City's decision on the Project include the following documents:

- The Notice of Preparation dated March 9, 2017, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project, including the Notices of Completion and Availability issued on or about December 14, 2017, providing notice that the DEIR had been completed and was available for public review and comment;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The DEIR for the Quarry Row Subdivision project, including the technical appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the DEIR;
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the City with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the DEIR;
- The FEIR for the Project, including comments received on the DEIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the DEIR and appendices (March 2020);
- All documents cited or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs;

- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, and responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's actions on Project;
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, through the close of the Planning Commission public hearing on December 15, 2020, and the close of the City Council public hearing on January 26, 2021;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings and public hearings;
- The City's General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The City's Zoning Ordinance and all other City Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the City;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the City regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to laws and regulations of federal, state, regional and local governments and special districts, as well as policies adopted by regional public agencies;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e) and any other applicable law.

The documents constituting the record of proceedings are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California, 95677. The custodian of these documents is the Community Development Director.

B. PREPARATION AND CONSIDERATION OF THE FEIR AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT FINDINGS

The City finds, with respect to the City's preparation, review and consideration of the FEIR, that:

1. The City prepared the DEIR, with the assistance of various sub-consultants, with input from the applicant, and under the supervision and at the direction of the City of Rocklin Community Development Department. The City, with the assistance of various

consultants, prepared the FEIR.

2. The City circulated the DEIR for review by responsible agencies and the public and submitted it to the State Clearinghouse for review and comment by state agencies.
3. The FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.
4. The Project will have significant, unavoidable impacts as described and discussed in the FEIR.
5. The FEIR is adequate under CEQA to address the potential environmental impacts of the Project.
6. The FEIR has been presented to the City of Rocklin Planning Commission and City of Rocklin City Council, and the Planning Commission and City Council have independently reviewed and considered information contained in the FEIR.
7. The FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

By these Findings, the City ratifies, adopts and incorporates the analyses, explanations, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the FEIR, except as may be specifically described in these Findings.

VI. CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS

The EIR evaluates the Project to determine whether it is consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. In this case, the relevant plans, policies and regulations are the City of Rocklin General Plan and the City of Rocklin Zoning Ordinance.

The project site is designated High Density Residential (5.8 acres) and Mixed Use (1.6 acres) on the City of Rocklin General Plan land use map. The entire site is zoned retail commercial (C-2). Approval of the Project includes re-designating and rezoning the entire project site to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and Planned Development Residential, 10.5 units per acre (PD-10.5), respectively. The resulting designation and zone would allow for the Project as proposed. The Project also requires Design Review and Oak Tree Preservation Plan entitlements from the City of Rocklin. Approval of such entitlements and compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies, as well as the mitigation measures identified and set forth herein, would ensure that development of the Project site would be consistent with applicable City plans.

VII. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

A detailed analysis of the potential environmental impacts and the proposed mitigation measures for the Project are set forth in Section 4.1, and Chapters 5 and 6 of the DEIR, with corrections and revisions as set forth in Chapter 2 of the FEIR. The DEIR evaluated the Project's potential environmental impacts on cultural resources, and also evaluated the Project's potential growth-inducing and cumulative impacts. The City concurs with the conclusions in the DEIR, as incorporated into the FEIR, that (i) changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen many of the potentially significant environmental effects

identified in the DEIR; and (ii) specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to substantially lessen or avoid the remaining significant impacts, as further described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Sections 21002 and 21002.1 of the Public Resources Code, and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, require the following:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Accordingly, for each significant impact identified herein, a finding has been made as to one or more of the following, as appropriate, in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091:

- A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR. Such changes or alterations reduce the significant environmental effect identified in the FEIR to a level of less than significant;
- B. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; and/or
- C. Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

A narrative, of supporting facts follows the appropriate finding. Whenever finding (C) was made,

the City has determined that there will be, even after mitigation, an unavoidable significant level of impact due to the Project, and sufficient mitigation is not feasible to reduce the impact to a level of less than significant. Such impacts are always specifically identified in the supporting discussions. The Statement of Overriding Considerations applies to all such unavoidable significant impacts, as required by sections 15092 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* {1982} 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) 'Feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Ibid. See also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.)

The CEQA Guidelines do not define the difference between "avoiding" a significant environmental effect and "substantially lessening" such an effect. The City must therefore glean the meaning of these terms from the other context in which the terms are used. Public Resources Code section 21081, on which CEQA Guidelines section 15091 is based, uses the term "mitigate" rather than "substantially lessen". The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate "mitigating" with "substantially lessening". Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects." (Pub. Resources Code section 21002.)

For purposes of these findings, the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less-than-significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less-than-significant level. These interpretations appear to be mandated by the holding in *Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 519-521, in which the Court of Appeal held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question to less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid(ed) or substantially lessen(ed)," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less-than-significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

Moreover, although section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant," these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Draft and Final EIR.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur.

Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a) and (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" outweigh its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects" and on that basis consider the adverse environmental effects acceptable" under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines sections 15093 and 15043(d). See also Pub. Resources Code section 21080(b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "(t)he wisdom of approving [any] development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore, balanced." (*Goleta II*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

These findings constitute the City's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the FEIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the City will implement these measures consistent with its decision to approve the Project.

VIII. CERTIFICATIONS

1. The City certifies that it has been presented with the Final EIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making the following certifications and findings.
2. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15090, the City certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The City certifies the Final EIR for the actions described in these Findings and in the Final EIR.
3. The City further certifies that the Final EIR reflects its independent judgment and analysis.
4. These Findings constitute the City's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these Findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the City hereby adopts the measures and binds itself to implement these measures as conditions of Project approval.
5. In adopting these mitigation measures, the City intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these Findings, said mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the Findings below by

reference. The City's Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project is included herein below.

IX. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project, and is being approved by the City by the same resolution that has adopted these Findings. The City will use the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached to and incorporated into the FEIR document and is approved in conjunction with certification of the FEIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

X. LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.). Based on substantial evidence in the whole of the record of this proceeding, including, more specifically the Initial Study and DEIR, the City finds that implementation of the Project will not result in significant impacts in the following areas and that these potential impact areas, therefore, do not require mitigation:

1. Aesthetics:

- a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista?
- b. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- c. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

2. Agricultural Resources:

- a. Would the project 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?
- b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. Would the project 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))?
- d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-

forest use?

- e. Would the project 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?

3. Air Quality:

- a. Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan?
- b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

4. Biological Resources:

- b. Would the project 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?
- c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d. Would the project 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?
- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

5. Geology and Soils

- a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault

Zone Map issued by the state Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); (ii) strong seismic ground shaking; (iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or (iv) landslides?

- b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c. Would the project 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?
- d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code {1994}, creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e. Would the project 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?

6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

- a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

- a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b. Would the project 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?
- c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d. Would the project 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?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

8. Hydrology and Water Quality:

- a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- e. Would the project 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?
- f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- j. Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

9. Land Use and Planning:

- a. Would the project physically divide an established community?
- b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

10. Mineral Resources:

- a. Would the project 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?
- b. Would the project 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?

11. Noise:

- b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

12. Population and Housing:

- a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure.)?
- b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

13. Public Services:

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: (1) fire protection, (2) police protection, (3) schools or (4) other public facilities?

14. Recreation:

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation at facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- 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?

15. Transportation, Traffic:

- a. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

16. Utilities and Service Systems:

- a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b. Would the proposed project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c. Would the proposed project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e. Would the project 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?
- f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

17. Energy

The Project's energy impacts are addressed on pages 6-10 through 6-12 of the DEIR. Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines in effect at the time of the preparation of the Draft EIR states that an EIR should consider the potentially significant energy implications of a project. These impacts could include:

- 1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project's life cycle including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.
- 2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
- 3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity

and other forms of energy.

4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
5. The effects of the project on energy resources.
6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

The Project would use energy resources for the operation of project buildings (i.e., electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (i.e. gasoline and diesel fuel) generated by the Project, and from off-road vehicles generated by and associated with the Project (i.e., diesel fuel). Each of these activities would require the use of energy resources. The Project would be responsible for conserving energy, to the extent feasible.

PG&E provides both electrical and natural gas service within the City. The Project is estimated to require approximately 2.0 million kBtus (thousand British thermal units, or 20,000 therms) per year and approximately 476,000 kWh (kilowatt hours per year). In 2015, Placer County used a total of 2,902 million kWh. The Project would therefore increase electricity use in the county by less than 1/10th of 1 percent. 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.

Natural gas use in Placer County totaled approximately 78.8 million therms in 2015. Similar to electricity, the Project's natural gas use would represent an increase of less than 1/10th of 1 percent of gas use 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 would not be wasteful or inefficient.

Once constructed, the Project would also increase the annual use of transportation fuel by an estimated 74,500 gallons of gasoline and 14,600 gallons of diesel 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.

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 of the Project and the City of Rocklin as a whole. For these reasons, and others (as described previously), the Project would not be expected to cause an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources nor cause a significant impact on any of the thresholds as described by Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines.

18. Growth-Inducement

Growth-inducing impacts are discussed on pages 6-7 and 6-8 of the DEIR. The Project would not induce growth for the reasons provided below.

Elimination of Obstacles to Growth

The elimination of either physical or regulatory obstacles to growth is considered to be a growth-inducing effect. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The extension of public service infrastructure, including roadways, water mains, and sewer lines, into areas that are not currently provided with these services would be expected to support new development. Similarly, the elimination or change to a regulatory obstacle, including existing growth and development policies, could result in new growth.

This is an infill project. The Project would connect to existing water, sewer, drainage and dry utility lines in adjacent streets. These facilities can accommodate the Project as currently sized. The Project would not require the extension of these facilities beyond the project site, and would not remove an obstacle to development of nearby parcels. For these reasons, the Project would not induce growth through the increased availability of infrastructure.

Economic Effects

New residential development typically generates a secondary or indirect demand for other services, such as grocery stores, dry cleaners, banking, and communications. This demand can lead to unforeseen future development if located in areas that are currently lacking a full spectrum of economic activity. The Project is located in an area that has a wide range of commercial services, and the City's General Plan provides for additional commercial development in the community, which will provide goods and services to the City's expanding population. Therefore, the Project would not induce unanticipated commercial growth.

19. Significant and Irreversible Effects

Under CEQA, an EIR must analyze the extent to which a project's primary and secondary effects would commit resources to uses that future generations will probably be unable to reverse [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c); 15127].

Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- The project would involve a large commitment of non-renewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of a project would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The phasing of the proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves a wasteful use of energy).

Implementation of the Project would result in the long-term commitment of resources to residential development. Specific long-term effects of the Project could include:

- Increased ambient noise;
- Irreversible commitment of municipal resources to the provision of service and infrastructure for future urban and suburban development;
- Irreversible consumption of goods and services associated with urban development;
- Increased traffic volumes on existing roadways;
- Irreversible consumption of natural resources;
- Contribution to global climate change through the generation of greenhouse gases, and
- Conversion of existing partially developed land to medium-high density residential uses.

As discussed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A), none of the above impacts would be significant.

Development of the Project would result in the dedication of the project site to residential development, thereby precluding other uses for the lifespan of the project. Restoration of the

project site to pre-development conditions would not be feasible given the degree of disturbance, the urbanization of the site, and the level of capital investment.

CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the Project. While the Project could result in the use, transport, storage and disposal of hazardous materials during construction and operation, as described in the Initial Study, Section VIII. "Hazards and Hazardous Materials", all activities will comply with applicant federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to hazardous materials, which significantly reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible damage.

Implementation of the Project would result in the long-term commitment of resources to development of the site into a medium-high density residential subdivision. The most notable significant irreversible impacts are a reduction in the natural vegetation, increased generation of pollutants, and the commitment of non-renewable and/or slowly renewable natural and energy resources, such as lumber and other forest products, mineral resources, and water resources during construction activities. Operations associated with future uses would also consume natural gas and electrical energy. These irreversible impacts are, as of yet, unavoidable consequences of urban growth.

XI. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The DEIR identified the potentially significant environmental impacts (or effects) that the Project could cause and/or contribute toward. A detailed analysis of potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures was set forth in Section 4.1 and Chapters 5 and 6 of the DEIR, and the applicable responses to comments on the DEIR in the FEIR. Based on the Initial Study, the DEIR focused its evaluation of the Project's potential environmental impacts on cultural resources. The Project's potential growth-inducing and cumulative impacts were also evaluated, as well as alternatives to the Project. Some of the Project's significant impacts can be fully avoided through adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other impacts can be lessened but cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, and thus will be significant and unavoidable. For reasons set forth herein, however, the City has determined that overriding economic, social, and other considerations outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project (see Section XVI, Statement of Overriding Considerations).

The City's findings with respect to the Project's significant impacts and mitigation measures are set forth in the FEIR and in these Findings. In making these Findings, the City ratifies, adopts and incorporates the analysis and explanation in the FEIR, and ratifies, adopts and incorporates into these Findings the determinations and conclusions of the FEIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these Findings.

A. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural Resource setting information for the Project is set forth in pages 4.1-1 through 4.1-8 of the DEIR. The standards of significance used to assess impacts on cultural resources are set forth in the DEIR on page 4.1-8. This information is incorporated into these findings as though fully set forth herein. Considering the above information, and the potential impacts identified in the FEIR, the findings of the City are as follows:

Impact 4.1-1 Loss of archaeological resources. (DEIR pages 4.1-9 and 4.1-10)

Explanation:

No prehistoric resources have been recorded on the project site or surrounding vicinity. No sacred lands have been recorded on the project site, and Native American representatives who were contacted by the City and a professional archaeologist did not indicate that there were tribal cultural resources present on the project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that archaeological resources are present, or would be discovered during excavation and construction. Nonetheless, because the project site is located in an area previously inhabited by Native Americans and the onsite building is of historical interest, such archaeological resources could be present. Therefore, there is some potential for project development to encounter previously unknown historic or prehistoric resources, particularly where deeper excavations would occur (e.g., utility lines). Although unlikely, the possible damage to or destruction of such resources, if present, would be a potentially significant impact.

Finding on Significance of Impact

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the potential impact from the Project on archaeological resources is expected to be significant because such resources, if present, could be damaged or destroyed during excavation and grading. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

4.1-1(a) 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 a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA) 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 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.

- (b) 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, to request the names of the 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 AB 2641 (2006).

Findings on Mitigation

The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measures are required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measures are appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen the potential adverse environmental effects associated with the Project by ensuring that archaeological resources, if unexpectedly found during construction, would be identified before they can be damaged or disturbed by further construction activities to the extent possible, and then treated appropriately after discovery. If human remains are encountered and the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the most likely descendent must be consulted regarding appropriate re-interment. The above-stated measures would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less-than-significant level (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

Impact 4.1-2 Loss of a historic building. (DEIR pages 4.1-10 and 4.1-11)

Explanation:

Construction of the Project would necessitate the removal of the existing structures and facilities, including Pleasure Hall and the quarried fence post and associated remnants. The removal of the fence post would not be a significant impact, because it is not considered eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). The Pleasure Hall building is considered a feature "of local interest" in the City's General Plan, and has been evaluated for historic significance and found to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 1,

because of its association with local history. The property retains its integrity of location, setting and association, but has diminished integrity of design, materials, workmanship and feeling due to alterations to the property after 1967, including additions to the building and changes to windows and door openings.

By demolishing Pleasure Hall, the Project would alter those characteristics that account for the building being eligible for listing on the CRHR, because the removal of the building would eliminate the physical evidence of the building and its historic use. This would be a significant impact.

It should be noted that while Pleasure Hall is presently or has recently been occupied by a scrapbook group, barber shop, photography office and dance studio, there have been changes in its setting and use. The Lincoln Transcontinental Highway, long ago replaced by Interstate 80, has become Pacific Street, which is a local facility, no longer a long-distance highway. It is no longer a public venue for musical performances and dances where the public can participate. Nor does it draw its audience from travelers.

Finding on Significance of Impact

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the Project's potential impact on historic resources would be significant due to removal of the Pleasure Hall building, which has been found eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

4.1-2 Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for Pleasure Hall, the building's use and history shall be documented in a Historic American Building Survey (HABS), including photographs, plans, drawings, interviews and written documentation, to preserve a definitive history of the building and its uses. The HABS report shall be provided to the appropriate depository or depositories (e.g., the Rocklin Historical Society).

Findings on Mitigation

Recordation of the building using HABS standards would ensure that the history and use of the Pleasure Hall building is well documented. Nonetheless, the building would no longer be eligible for listing on the CRHR, because it would be demolished. The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measures are required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measure is appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen, but not avoid the potential adverse environmental effects of approving and implementing the Project by requiring that an appropriate record be made of the Pleasure Hall building prior to its demolition. No additional feasible measures are available to reduce this impact below a level of significance (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The Cultural Resource Assessment recommended that two additional mitigation measures be considered—preserving the building in place and moving the building to a similar setting. The City considered

these measures, but found them to be infeasible. The Project as proposed precludes retention of the building in place, so preservation as mitigation would require substantial revisions to the Project. Relocation of the building would enable the development of the project as proposed. However, the City is not aware of an appropriate location that would both be available and sized to accommodate the building, and would have a similar setting and ties to the historic period. Further, due to its age and concrete construction, it was determined by a professional home and building moving company that it would not be feasible to relocate the building without extensive damage (see DEIR, Appendix I). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

To the extent that this adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or eliminated by the above mitigation, the City Council finds that specific economic, social and other considerations described in this section and in Section XIV (Findings Related to Project Alternatives), make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. Further, the City Council finds that such considerations support the approval of the Project.

In addition to the rationale and reasoning for rejecting the identified mitigation measures and project alternatives as described above and in Section XIV, the City Council further finds the following reasons for rejecting the identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

A. Rejected Project Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development): Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no additional development would occur on the project site and no future construction would occur. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development), as further described below.

Alternative 1 is rejected because it would not meet any of the project objectives since no development or construction would occur. All of the project objectives pertaining to the use and development of the project site and the construction of housing there upon would not be met.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make infeasible Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Consistency with the General Plan.** The project site is designated Mixed Use (MU) and High Density Residential (HDR) on the City of Rocklin General Plan land use map. The Project is requesting a General Plan Amendment from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such an entitlement would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with the City's General Plan. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the General Plan Amendment would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the intent of the City's General Plan.
- 2. Consistency with the City's Zoning Ordinance.** The project site is zoned Retail Business (C-2). The Project is requesting a Rezone and a General Development Plan from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such entitlements would ensure that development of the infill site would be

consistent with City's Zoning Ordinance. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the Rezone would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the intent of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

- 3. Consistency with the General Plan EIR.** The General Plan EIR contemplates the environmental impacts of implementation of the General Plan land use designations, goals and policies, and identifies impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration. The General Plan EIR anticipated development of the project site with land uses that do not differ substantially from the Project's land uses. The Initial Study and DEIR for this Project, and these Findings, incorporate, either expressly or by reference, such impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration that are applicable to the Project. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the General Plan EIR would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the land uses and anticipated development contemplated by the General Plan EIR.
- 4. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 5. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);

- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

6. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

7. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

8. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

9. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable

for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and

- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

- 10. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
- 11. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 12. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 13. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and

compact development.

- 14. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 15. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 16. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 17. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 18. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

B. Rejected Project Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action): Under the No Project/No Action Alternative, development would occur on the project site under the existing General Plan designations for Mixed Use and High Density Residential. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action), as further described below.

Although Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not result in impacts being less severe than the Project, and would in fact result in impacts being more severe than the Project. While Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate

80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion, and 2) Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Alternative 2 is rejected.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make infeasible Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);

- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);

- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of

the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project is generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the

economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.

- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

C. Rejected Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density): Under the Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density Alternative, the existing historic Pleasure Hall building would be retained on site. A total of 64 dwelling units would be developed, but they would be within the 5.8 acre portion of the project site that is currently designated for High Density Residential uses, resulting in a density of 11 units per acre. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density) as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

Project Alternative 3 would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall, and reduce impacts on cultural resources and some biological resources primarily due to the reduction in ground disturbance. However, Project Alternative 3 would not achieve the project objectives of providing housing opportunities and/or contributing to the City's efforts to provide affordable housing as part of the Project, because only 64 units would be constructed and none would be reserved for low-income residents.

The Project as revised in the Final EIR would provide 74 units, ten more units than would be provided by Project Alternative 3. In addition, approximately 10 percent of those units would be affordable. If 74 units were constructed on only 5.8 acres, it would not be as compatible with the

surrounding neighborhoods as it is not physically possible to build 74 detached, single-family dwellings on 5.8 acres without these dwellings either having a very small living area or being three stories in height, rather than a standard two-story height. Reducing the physical area to 5.8 acres to construct this number of dwelling units would require increasing the building height to accommodate the necessary square footage for a dwelling unit. This increased massing is not compatible with the adjoining neighborhood of existing one-story, single-family homes.

Additionally, there is not a market demand for three-story, detached single-family homes on the site. This site is located within the Racetrack/Tuttle/Winner's Circle residential neighborhood, which neighborhood consists of traditional one- and two-story homes that were built approximately 40 or more years ago. Across Grove Street from the project site is the Royal Oaks Mobile Home Park, which consists of one-story mobile homes. In this particular location, meeting market demand requires compatibility with the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. Two-story residential units on the site are compatible with the market and the neighborhood, whereas three-story residential units would not be so compatible. Thus, for market-related reasons, three-story detached single-family homes on this site are not feasible.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and

scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);

- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9);
and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a

project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and

- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2,

Housing Element, p. 7-83);

- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
 - e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).
- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

D. Rejected Project Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint): Under the Reduced Density with Similar Footprint Alternative, development would occur on the project site at a lower density than the Project, resulting in a total of 40 single family homes. At a density of 5.4 units per acre, these units would be considered Medium Density Residential. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint), as further described below.

Project Alternative 4 would reduce some project impacts, but would not avoid the significant and unavoidable loss of the Pleasure Hall. While Alternative 4 would achieve some of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Maximize development on a parcel with minimal natural resources; 2) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion; 3) Provide a project that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, including its guiding principles and strategies as they relate to smart land use, access and mobility and compact development; and 4) Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Project Alternative 4 is rejected.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make Project Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint) infeasible, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);

- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9);
and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans

and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- b. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- e. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- f. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- g. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- h. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production

of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and

- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).
- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
 - 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
 - 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
 - 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent

with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.

- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

E. Rejected Preserve Pleasure Hall Building in Place Mitigation Measure: Beyond Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 noted above, the Cultural Resource Assessment recommended an additional optional mitigation measure of preserving the Pleasure Hall building in place. In response to the suggested optional mitigation measure, the Final EIR included Alternative 3: Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density. Under the Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density Alternative, the existing historic Pleasure Hall building would be retained on site. A total of 64 dwelling units would be developed, but they would be within the 5.8 acre portion of the project

site that is currently designated for High Density Residential uses, resulting in a density of 11 units per acre. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measure to preserve the Pleasure Hall Building in place as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

The mitigation measure would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall, and reduce impacts on cultural resources and some biological resources primarily due to the reduction in ground disturbance. However, the mitigation measure would not achieve the project objectives of providing housing opportunities and/or contributing to the City's efforts to provide affordable housing as part of the Project, because only 64 units would be constructed and none would be reserved for low-income residents.

The Project as revised in the Final EIR would provide 74 units, ten more units than would be provided by the mitigation measure. In addition, approximately 10 percent of those units would be affordable. If 74 units were constructed on only 5.8 acres, it would not be as compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods as it is not physically possible to build 74 detached, single-family dwellings on 5.8 acres without these dwellings either having a very small living area or being three stories in height, rather than a standard two-story height. Reducing the physical area to 5.8 acres to construct this number of dwelling units would require increasing the building height to accommodate the necessary square footage for a dwelling unit. This increased massing is not compatible with the adjoining neighborhood of existing one-story, single-family homes.

Additionally, there is not a market demand for three-story, detached single-family homes on the site. This site is located within the Racetrack/Tuttle/Winner's Circle residential neighborhood, which neighborhood consists of traditional one- and two-story homes that were built approximately 40 or more years ago. Across Grove Street from the project site is the Royal Oaks Mobile Home Park, which consists of one-story mobile homes. In this particular location, meeting market demand requires compatibility with the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. Two-story residential units on the site are compatible with the market and the neighborhood, whereas three-story residential units would not be so compatible. Thus, for market-related reasons, three-story detached single-family homes on this site are not feasible.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible the mitigation measure to preserve the Pleasure Hall building in place, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:

- a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9);
and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool

for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);

- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- c. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level

standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

- 6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:
- i. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
 - j. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
 - k. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
 - l. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
 - e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).
- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning

Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund,

which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.

- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

F. Rejected Mitigation Measure (Move Pleasure Hall): Beyond Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 noted above, the Cultural Resource Assessment recommended an additional optional mitigation measure of moving the Pleasure Hall building to a similar setting. In response to the suggested optional mitigation measure, the Final EIR included a Relocate Pleasure Hall Alternative, but this alternative was identified in the Draft EIR as an alternative that was considered but eliminated from further analysis and thus it was not evaluated in detail.

The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measure to move the Pleasure Hall Building to a similar setting as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

As identified in the Final EIR, the removal of the historic Pleasure Hall building located on the project site would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project. In certain circumstances, relocation of a historic structure can serve as mitigation. In this case, the City is not aware of an appropriate location that would both be available and sized to accommodate the building, and would have a similar setting and ties to the historic period. Furthermore, due to its age and concrete construction, it was determined by a professional home and building moving company that it would not be possible to relocate the building without extensive damage (see DEIR, Appendix I).

The mitigation measure that was considered but rejected from further analysis would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall and reduce impacts on cultural resources. However, the mitigation measure was determined not to be feasible as discussed above.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible the mitigation measure to relocate the Pleasure Hall Building to a similar setting, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:

- a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- d. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or

projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- m. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- n. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- o. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- p. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and

encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and

amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.

- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

Impact 4.1-3 Loss of paleontological resources. (DEIR pages 4.1-11 and 4.11-12)

Explanation:

Because most of the project site overlays a geologic formation that does not support fossils and the site has been heavily disturbed, it is not likely that paleontological resource would be uncovered during excavation and grading. A small portion of the project site might contain Pleistocene alluvium, which could contain fossils. The type of development that would be undertaken would not, for the most part, require extensive excavation, because most buildings would be only two stories tall. Nonetheless, excavation would be required for utility lines and other features. Although unlikely, if paleontological resources are present in the project site, they could be damaged or destroyed during grading or excavation. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Finding on Significance of Impact

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the potential impact from the Project during project construction is expected to be significant because there is the possibility that paleontological resources could be damaged or destroyed during grading or excavation, particularly for utility lines and other features. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

4.1-3 If paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are discovered during construction, the contractor shall immediately cease all work activities in the vicinity (within approximately 100 feet) of the discovery. After cessation of excavation the contractor shall immediately contact a qualified paleontologist and the City of Rocklin Environmental Services Manager. The potential paleontological resource(s) discovered during construction shall be evaluated by the qualified paleontologist. If it is determined that the project could damage a unique paleontological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines), mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall develop a treatment plan in consultation with the City's Environmental Services Manager. If determined appropriate by the paleontologist, the find shall be deposited at an appropriate repository, such as Sierra College or the University of California Museum of Paleontology. The contractor shall not resume work until authorization is received from the City's Environmental Services Manager.

Findings on Mitigation

The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measures are required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measures are appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen the potential adverse environmental effects associated with the Project by ensuring that if paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work would cease until the resource could be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist, and provisions made for the appropriate disposition of the resource. The above-stated measures would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less-than-significant level (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

XII. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative context for the assessment of cumulative effects is set forth on pages 4.1-12 and 6-1 of the DEIR. The cumulative setting for cultural resources includes the City of Rocklin and Placer County for historic period resources, and the portions of Sacramento Valley identified as the territory of the local Native American community for prehistoric archaeological resources. Historic resources tend to be more highly concentrated within cities and urban communities. However, even within these urbanized areas, many historic resources have not been surveyed for significance under local, State, or federal criteria. The cumulative setting for paleontological resources is Placer County and the Central Valley, particularly those areas with geologic formations that could contain fossils. For other resources, the cumulative analyses included in the DEIR are based on an understanding of anticipated growth within the region that would affect the severity of Project impacts, typically based on adopted plans (e.g., General Plans). Different analyses use different cumulative development scenarios, because the location of future growth that affects cumulative impacts differs by the type of resource. As an example, the appropriate cumulative development base for ozone precursors would be growth throughout the Sacramento

Valley air basin, because growth throughout the air basin contributes to air pollution. For each impact, the cumulative development base must be determined after consideration of the way in which cumulative impacts are created.

A. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.1-4 Cumulative loss of archaeological resources. (DEIR pages 4.1-12 and 4.1-13)

Explanation:

Placer County and the greater region have been inhabited by the foothill and Valley Nisenan and their ancestors for thousands of years. Evidence of this habitation has been found throughout the region, including seasonal camp sites, village sites and milling stations. In addition, there remain buildings and sites associated with gold mining, early agricultural development and other historic periods. Development within the region, including the City of Rocklin and Placer County, could be located in areas that have the potential to contain both prehistoric and historic archaeological resources that would be vulnerable to damage or destruction from construction activities. This would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.

As discussed in Impact 4.1-1, no evidence of archaeological resources was identified during a field survey of the project site. Nonetheless, it is possible that there could be subsurface resources. If any such resources are present, they could be damaged or destroyed during project construction, which would be a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of archaeological resources.

Finding on Contribution of Project to Cumulative Effect

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the potential destruction of or damage to prehistoric archaeological resources during project construction is expected to be significant because it would contribute considerably to the cumulative loss of these resources. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 4.1-4:

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.

Findings on Mitigation

The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measure is required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measure is appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen the potential adverse environmental effects associated with the Project by ensuring that archaeological resources within the plan area are identified and protected before they can be damaged by construction activities, and that they are treated appropriately after

discovery. The above-stated measures would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less-than-significant level (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

Impact 4.1-5 Cumulative loss of historic resources. (DEIR pages 4.1-13 and 4.1-14)

Explanation:

Development pressure throughout Placer County has resulted in infill and redevelopment of downtown areas, and the conversion of rural and agricultural properties to urban and suburban uses. In some cases, older buildings have been demolished, or the areas around them have been developed, so that their original context is altered. As development continues, historic resources will continue to be destroyed or altered. As a result, information about the history of the Placer County, including Rocklin and other cities, could be irretrievably lost, and the character of historic areas will continue to change. The City of Rocklin has adopted General Plan policies to minimize the loss of historic resources. For example, Policy LU-41 encourages development of vacant lands and rehabilitation of existing buildings within Rocklin’s Historic District. Policy OCR-62 calls for preservation of historically significant resources in place if feasible, and provision of appropriate mitigation for those resources that cannot be preserved. These and other General Plan policies and regulations would provide protection to historic resources. However, there could be cases where historic buildings or other features are removed to accommodate development. This is a significant cumulative impact.

The Project would contribute to the regional cumulative loss of and alteration to historic resources by demolishing the Pleasure Hall building, which is of local historical interest and eligible for listing on the CRHR. This would be a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of historic resources.

Finding on Contribution of Project to Cumulative Effect

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the potential loss and/or alteration of historic resources to accommodate the Project is expected to be significant because it would contribute considerably to the cumulative loss of historic resources in the County. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 4.1-5:

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2.

Findings on Mitigation

Recordation of the building using HABS standards would ensure that the history and use of the

Pleasure Hall building is well documented. Nonetheless, the building would no longer be eligible for listing on the CRHR, because it would be demolished. The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measures are required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measure is appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen, but not avoid the potential adverse environmental effects of approving and implementing the Project by requiring that an appropriate record be made of the Pleasure Hall building prior to its demolition. No additional feasible measures are available to reduce this impact below a level of significance (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The Cultural Resource Assessment recommended that two additional mitigation measures be considered—preserving the building in place and moving the building to a similar setting. The City considered these measures, but found them to be infeasible. The Project as proposed precludes retention of the building in place, so preservation as mitigation would require substantial revisions to the Project. Relocation of the building would enable the development of the project as proposed. However, the City is not aware of an appropriate location that would both be available and sized to accommodate the building, and would have a similar setting and ties to the historic period. Further, due to its age and concrete construction, it was determined by a professional home and building moving company that it would not be feasible to relocate the building without extensive damage (see DEIR, Appendix I).

The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard. The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measure is required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measures are appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen, but not avoid the potential adverse environmental effects of approving and implementing the Project by ensuring that historic resources are properly recorded prior to demolition. No additional feasible measures are available to reduce this impact below a level of significance (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

To the extent that this adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or eliminated by the above mitigation, the City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social and other considerations described in this section and in Section XIV (Findings Related to Project Alternatives), make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. Further, the City Council finds that such considerations support the approval of the Project.

In addition to the rationale and reasoning for rejecting the identified mitigation measures and project alternatives as described above and in Section XIV, the City Council further finds the following reasons for rejecting the identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

A. Rejected Project Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development): Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no additional development would occur on the project site and no future construction would occur. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development), as further described below.

Alternative 1 is rejected because it would not meet any of the project objectives since no development or construction would occur. All of the project objectives pertaining to the use and development of the project site and the construction of housing there upon would not be met.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make infeasible Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Consistency with the General Plan.** The project site is designated Mixed Use (MU) and High Density Residential (HDR) on the City of Rocklin General Plan land use map. The Project is requesting a General Plan Amendment from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such an entitlement would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with the City's General Plan. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the General Plan Amendment would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the intent of the City's General Plan.
- 2. Consistency with the City's Zoning Ordinance.** The project site is zoned Retail Business (C-2). The Project is requesting a Rezone and a General Development Plan from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such entitlements would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with City's Zoning Ordinance. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the Rezone would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the intent of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3. Consistency with the General Plan EIR.** The General Plan EIR contemplates the environmental impacts of implementation of the General Plan land use designations, goals and policies, and identifies impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration. The General Plan EIR anticipated development of the project site with land uses that do not differ substantially from the Project's land uses. The Initial Study and DEIR for this Project, and these Findings, incorporate, either expressly or by reference, such impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration that are applicable to the Project. The inability to develop the property in accordance with the General Plan EIR would preclude the site from being utilized in a way which fully realizes the land uses and anticipated development contemplated by the General Plan EIR.
- 4. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 5. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of

Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);

- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

6. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural

resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);

- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

7. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

8. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes

effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

9. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

10. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 11. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 12. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 13. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 14. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 15. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 16. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 17. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of

a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.

- 18. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

B. Rejected Project Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action): Under the No Project/No Action Alternative, development would occur on the project site under the existing General Plan designations for Mixed Use and High Density Residential. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action), as further described below.

Although Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not result in impacts being less severe than the Project, and would in fact result in impacts being more severe than the Project. While Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion, and 2) Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Alternative 2 is rejected.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make infeasible Alternative 2 (No Project/No Action) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General

Plan, p. 2-2);

- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);

- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the

community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);

- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see "Blueprint Preferred Scenario" and "Blueprint Growth Principles", SACOG Blueprint web page).

9. **Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
10. **Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project is generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
11. **Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
12. **Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
13. **Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
14. **Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
15. **Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

C. Rejected Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density): Under the Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density Alternative, the existing historic Pleasure Hall building would be retained on site. A total of 64 dwelling units would be developed, but they would be within the 5.8 acre portion of the project site that is currently designated for High Density Residential uses, resulting in a density of 11 units per acre. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density) as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

Project Alternative 3 would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall, and reduce impacts on cultural resources and some biological resources primarily due to the reduction in ground disturbance. However, Project Alternative 3 would not achieve the project objectives of providing housing opportunities and/or contributing to the City's efforts to provide affordable housing as part of the Project, because only 64 units would be constructed and none would be reserved for low-income residents.

The Project as revised in the Final EIR would provide 74 units, ten more units than would be provided by Project Alternative 3. In addition, approximately 10 percent of those units would be affordable. If 74 units were constructed on only 5.8 acres, it would not be as compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods as it is not physically possible to build 74 detached, single-family dwellings on 5.8 acres without these dwellings either having a very small living area or being three stories in height, rather than a standard two-story height. Reducing the physical area to 5.8 acres to construct this number of dwelling units would require increasing the building height to accommodate the necessary square footage for a dwelling unit. This increased massing is not compatible with the adjoining neighborhood of existing one-story, single-family homes.

Additionally, there is not a market demand for three-story, detached single-family homes on the site. This site is located within the Racetrack/Tuttle/Winner's Circle residential neighborhood, which neighborhood consists of traditional one- and two-story homes that were built approximately 40 or more years ago. Across Grove Street from the project site is the Royal Oaks Mobile Home Park, which consists of one-story mobile homes. In this particular location, meeting market demand requires compatibility with the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. Two-story residential units on the site are compatible with the market and the neighborhood, whereas three-story residential units would not be so compatible. Thus, for market-related reasons, three-story detached single-family homes on this site are not feasible.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible Project Alternative 3 (Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density) as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:

- a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9);
and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to

approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise

standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and

- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant

property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.

- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

D. Rejected Project Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint): Under the Reduced Density with Similar Footprint Alternative, development would occur on the project site at a lower density than the Project, resulting in a total of 40 single family homes. At a density of 5.4 units per acre, these units would be considered Medium Density Residential. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint), as further described below.

Project Alternative 4 would reduce some project impacts, but would not avoid the significant and unavoidable loss of the Pleasure Hall. While Alternative 4 would achieve some of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Maximize development on a parcel with minimal natural resources; 2) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion; 3) Provide a project that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, including its guiding principles and strategies as they relate to smart land use, access and mobility and compact development; and 4) Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Project Alternative 4 is rejected.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the economic, social, technological and environmental benefits of the Project make Project Alternative 4 (Reduced Density with Similar Footprint) infeasible, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new

residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:

- a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and

Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discourages (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and

- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the

Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will

benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.

- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

E. Rejected Preserve Pleasure Hall Building in Place Mitigation Measure: Beyond Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 noted above, the Cultural Resource Assessment recommended an additional optional mitigation measure of preserving the Pleasure Hall building in place. In response to the suggested optional mitigation measure, the Final EIR included Alternative 3: Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density. Under the Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density Alternative, the existing historic Pleasure Hall building would be retained on site. A total of 64 dwelling units would be developed, but they would be within the 5.8 acre portion of the project site that is currently designated for High Density Residential uses, resulting in a density of 11 units per acre. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measure to preserve the Pleasure Hall Building in place as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

The mitigation measure would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall, and reduce impacts on cultural resources and some biological resources primarily due to the reduction in ground disturbance. However, the mitigation measure would not achieve the project objectives of providing housing opportunities and/or contributing to the City's efforts to provide affordable housing as part of the Project, because only 64 units would be constructed and none would be reserved for low-income residents.

The Project as revised in the Final EIR would provide 74 units, ten more units than would be provided by the mitigation measure. In addition, approximately 10 percent of those units would be affordable. If 74 units were constructed on only 5.8 acres, it would not be as compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods as it is not physically possible to build 74 detached, single-family dwellings on 5.8 acres without these dwellings either having a very small living area or being three stories in height, rather than a standard two-story height. Reducing the physical area to 5.8 acres to construct this number of dwelling units would require increasing the building height to accommodate the necessary square footage for a dwelling unit. This increased massing is not compatible with the adjoining neighborhood of existing one-story, single-family homes.

Additionally, there is not a market demand for three-story, detached single-family homes on the site. This site is located within the Racetrack/Tuttle/Winner's Circle residential neighborhood, which neighborhood consists of traditional one- and two-story homes that were built approximately 40 or more years ago. Across Grove Street from the project site is the Royal Oaks Mobile Home Park, which consists of one-story mobile homes. In this particular location, meeting

market demand requires compatibility with the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. Two-story residential units on the site are compatible with the market and the neighborhood, whereas three-story residential units would not be so compatible. Thus, for market-related reasons, three-story detached single-family homes on this site are not feasible.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible the mitigation measure to preserve the Pleasure Hall building in place, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);

- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);

- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of

the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the

economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.

- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

F. Rejected Mitigation Measure (Move Pleasure Hall): Beyond Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 noted above, the Cultural Resource Assessment recommended an additional optional mitigation measure of moving the Pleasure Hall building to a similar setting. In response to the suggested optional mitigation measure, the Final EIR included a Relocate Pleasure Hall Alternative, but this alternative was identified in the Draft EIR as an alternative that was considered but eliminated from further analysis and thus it was not evaluated in detail.

The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measure to move the Pleasure Hall Building to a similar setting as identified in the Final EIR, as further described below.

As identified in the Final EIR, the removal of the historic Pleasure Hall building located on the project site would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project. In certain circumstances, relocation of a historic structure can serve as mitigation. In this case, the City is not aware of an appropriate location that would both be available and sized to accommodate the building, and would have a similar setting and ties to the historic period. Furthermore, due to its age and concrete construction, it was determined by a professional home and building moving company that it would not be possible to relocate the building without extensive damage (see DEIR, Appendix I).

The mitigation measure that was considered but rejected from further analysis would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall and reduce impacts on cultural resources. However, the mitigation measure was determined not to be feasible as discussed above.

The City Council further finds that the following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project make infeasible the mitigation measure to relocate the Pleasure Hall Building to a similar setting, as identified in the Final EIR.

- 1. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Accordingly, the development will be compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- 2. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies.** Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:
 - a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
 - b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
 - f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
 - h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);

- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9); and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

3. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project and develop the site would be inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

4. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);

- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

5. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and
- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

6. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. Failure to approve the Project is inconsistent with and would fail to advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of

the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

- 7. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)
- 8. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would not implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 9. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** Failure to approve the Project will hinder the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. Through the Project, the underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 10. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** Failure to approve the Project would be generally inconsistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 11. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the

economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.

- 12. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 13. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 14. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.
- 15. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

Impact 4.1-6 Cumulative loss of paleontological resources. (DEIR pages 4.14-14 and 4.1-15)

Explanation:

Paleontological resources are known to occur on certain geologic formations that occur within Placer County, and elsewhere in the Sacramento Valley. Those areas where fossils have been found in the past are considered most likely to contain paleontological resources, but there is potential for such resources to occur wherever these formations are present. Excavation and grading in areas with geologic formations that are able to contain paleontological resources could result in the damage or destruction of fossils and related resources, including fossils of large vertebrates. This would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.

As discussed in Impact 4.1-3, the majority of the project site does not contain geologic formations that have yielded paleontological resources elsewhere in the region. Nonetheless, it is possible that fossils could be present, particularly in the small portion of the project site that could contain Pleistocene alluvium. If paleontological resources are present, then construction of the Project could damage or destroy such resources, which would be a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of paleontological resources.

Finding on Contribution of Project to Cumulative Effect

Based on the analysis contained within the DEIR and the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the standards of significance, the City Council finds that the potential damage to or destruction of paleontological resources during project construction is expected to be significant because it would contribute to the cumulative loss of these resources in the region. The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict its conclusion in this regard.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 4.1-6:

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-3.

Findings on Mitigation

The City Council finds that the above-stated mitigation measures are required of the Project. The City Council further finds that the above measures are appropriate and feasible, and would substantially lessen the potential adverse environmental effects associated with the Project by ensuring that paleontological resources are identified and protected if they are encountered during construction. The above-stated measures would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less-than-significant level (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091, 15126.4, subd. (a)(2)). The City Council has been presented with no evidence to contradict their conclusion in this regard.

B. OTHER CUMULATIVE ANALYSES

As discussed in Section 10, above, the Initial Study found that the Project would have a number of less-than-significant impacts, including impacts on oak trees and exposure of residents to noise, which would require mitigation. The Initial Study addresses the potential for the Project to contribute to the cumulative effects in these areas (pages 19 through 22, 36 through 40, 53 and 54, 69 through 71, and 79 and 80). In addition, cumulative impacts are summarized on pages 6-1 through 6-5 in Chapter 6 of the DEIR. With the exception of the cumulative impacts on cultural resources (Impacts 4.1-4 through 4.1-5, above), the project contributions toward cumulative impacts would not be considerable, and would therefore be less than significant.

XIII. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

According to CEQA Guidelines [Section 15126, subd. (b); Section 21000, subd. (b).], a Draft EIR must include a description of those impacts identified as significant and unavoidable should the proposed action be implemented. These impacts are unavoidable because it has been determined that either no mitigation, or only partial mitigation, is feasible. The final determination of significance of impacts and of the feasibility of mitigation measures would be made by the Planning Commission and/or City Council as part of certification action.

The potential environmental impacts that would result from Project are summarized in Table 2-1 of the DEIR. The only project impacts that would be significant and unavoidable would be the removal of the existing Pleasure Hall building which is of local historical interest and eligible for listing on the CRHR:

- 4.1-2 Loss of a historically significant building, and
- 4.1-5 Cumulative loss of historic resources.

XIV. FINDINGS RELATED TO PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

As required by CEQA, a discussion of possible alternatives to the Project was included in the FEIR. The City makes the following findings to support its rejection of the three alternatives that were considered and eliminated from further analysis and the four alternatives that were analyzed in the DEIR. Other alternatives were considered and screened out of the range of alternatives fully analyzed in the EIR for the reasons discussed on pages 5-3 and 5-4 of the DEIR, and below.

Section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines describes that one of the findings that a lead agency can make concerning significant project impacts is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the EIR. In the EIR, the alternatives were screened for technical, logistical, and financial feasibility, but the alternatives were not evaluated for all economic, legal, social or other considerations that make up the broader definition of "feasibility" in Section 15091(a)(3). Thus, the use of the term "infeasible" in the findings below concerning the alternatives is more expansive than references to "feasible" in the EIR's discussion of alternatives, which was limited to technical, logistical and financial feasibility. An alternative may have been determined to be technically, logistically, and financially "feasible" in the EIR and still ultimately be concluded by the City to meet the definition of "infeasibility" per Section 15091(a)(3) when all considerations are taken into account. The term "infeasible" in the findings below uses the broader definition in Section 15091 (a)(3), which is consistent with case law interpreting this provision of CEQA. The determination of infeasibility "involves a balancing of various 'economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417). Where there are competing and conflicting interests to be resolved, the determination of infeasibility "is not a case of straightforward questions of legal or economic feasibility," but rather, based on policy considerations. (*Cal. Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001-02). "[A]n alternative that is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint may be rejected as infeasible." (*Id.* at p. 1002, citing 2 Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act, (Cont.Ed.Bar 2010) section 17.29, p. 824).

Consistent with CEQA, primary consideration was given to alternatives that could reduce significant impacts while still meeting most of the basic project objectives. Any alternative that would have impacts identical to or more severe than the proposed project, or that would not meet any or most of the project objectives were dismissed from further consideration. Three alternatives were considered but dismissed in the DEIR.

A. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

The following alternatives were considered briefly on pages 5-3 and 5-4 of the DEIR, but were not evaluated in detail because they would not achieve most of the project objectives and/or reduce impacts of the Project.

All Non-Residential Development

The Project is intended to develop the project site with housing consistent with the policy direction of the General Plan while being sensitive to surrounding residences. Developing the entire project site with non-residential uses would not achieve the objectives of developing Medium High Density Residential housing in proximity to and compatible with surrounding residential uses, and in proximity to downtown Rocklin, retail commercial uses and transportation corridors. Furthermore, full commercial development is not likely to reduce project impacts. Therefore, an all non-residential project is not evaluated further.

Off-Site Alternative

The project site has been identified as a site for higher density housing in the General Plan Land Use Map and Housing Element. While there are other locations that are designated for such housing, the project applicant lacks ownership or control of any alternative sites. Further, an off-site alternative may not meet the following project objectives: (1) making efficient use of an under-utilized infill parcel; (2) maximizing development on a parcel with minimal natural resources, and (3) providing Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion. Depending on the location, an offsite alternative could have greater impacts on natural resources and/or traffic and traffic-related air emissions and noise. For these reasons, an offsite alternative is not considered further.

Relocate Pleasure Hall Building

As indicated above, the removal of the historic Pleasure Hall building located on the project site would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project. In certain circumstances, relocation of a historic structure can serve as mitigation. In this case, the City is not aware of an appropriate location that would both be available and sized to accommodate the building, and would have a similar setting and ties to the historic period. Furthermore, due to its age and concrete construction, it was determined by a professional home and building moving company that it would not be possible to relocate the building without extensive damage (see DEIR, Appendix I).

B. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Each of the four alternatives is described below, followed by a discussion of the extent to which the impacts of the alternative would be similar to, more severe than or less severe than the impacts of the Project. As allowed by CEQA, only significant impacts and those that require

mitigation to be less than significant are addressed, and the analysis is less detailed than the analysis of Project impacts found in Chapter 4 of the DEIR and the Initial Study.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

Alternative 1 is discussed on pages 5-4 and 5-5 of the DEIR.

Description

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no additional development would occur on the project site and no future construction would occur.

Relationship of Alternative 1 to Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would not achieve any of the project objectives. Because no development would occur, this alternative would not make efficient use of an under-utilized infill parcel, maximize development on a parcel with minimal natural resources, provide housing opportunities, or promote the provision of a range of housing types.

Environmental Analysis

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Project

Alternative 1 would not have any impacts that would be the same or similar to the Project.

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Project

Alternative 1 would avoid all of the significant or potentially significant impacts of the Project, including the loss of the Pleasure Hall building (DEIR Impacts 4.1-2 and 4.1-5), the potential loss of archaeological and paleontological resources (DEIR Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-3, 4.1-4 and 4.1-6), effects on protected species and oak trees (Initial Study Items IV.a and IV.e), and exposure to traffic noise and increases in noise levels (Initial Study Items XII.a ,b, c and d).

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Project

Alternative 1 would not have any impacts that are more severe than the Project.

Rejection of Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is rejected because it would not meet any of the project objectives since no development or construction would occur. All of the project objectives pertaining to the use and development of the project site and the construction of housing there upon would not be met.

Alternative 2: No Project/No Action

CEQA requires that a second type of “No Project” alternative be evaluated, herein called the “No Project/No Action” alternative. The purpose of the No Project/No Action alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of the Project with the impacts of not approving the project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1)]. In the case of a revision to an existing land use plan, such as the General Plan, the No Project/No Action alternative is the continuation of the existing plan [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A)]. For the purposes of this EIR, the No Project/No Action alternative is the development that would occur under the existing General Plan designations for Mixed Use and High Density Residential.

Description

In defining the type and intensity of uses for the No Project/No Action alternative, the City must determine what would be reasonably foreseeable if the project site were to develop under the existing General Plan designations. At present, 1.6+/- acres are designated Mixed Use and 5.8+/- acres are designated High Density Residential.

For the Mixed Use designation, it was assumed that the site would develop a retail commercial use at a floor area ratio of 0.25, in keeping with proximate commercial uses, resulting in 17,400 square feet of retail or other commercial uses. The building or buildings would be a single story, and would be set back a minimum of 5 feet from the Pacific Street right-of-way, a minimum of 10 feet from the Grove Street right of way, and a minimum of 10 feet from the southern and eastern property boundaries. A driveway would provide access to Pacific Street. Approximately 87 surface parking spaces would be provided.

The existing Pleasure Hall building would be removed in order to provide adequate space for the commercial development and associated parking and infrastructure.

For the residential portion of Alternative 2, it is assumed that 22 units per acre would be developed, consistent with the General Plan Housing Element assumptions in the Available Sites Table. As a result, there would be 128 units constructed on the project site. These units are assumed to be subject to the development standards for the R-3 zone. Because of the higher density and coverage and setback requirements, it is assumed that two-story apartment buildings would be constructed with a combination of one-, two- and three-bedroom units. Lot coverage would be limited to 60 percent. Front setbacks would be a minimum of 20 feet. Rear and street-side setbacks would be a minimum of 15 feet. The interior side setback would be at least 10 feet. Parking would be provided at the minimums specified in the Zoning Code, resulting in an estimated 320 spaces for residents and guests, of which a minimum of 120 would be covered. Access to the project site would be provided by two entrances—one connecting to Pacific Street and the other to Grove Street.

Relationship of Alternative 2 to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would achieve the project objectives by providing additional housing in proximity to other housing and nearby commercial uses. In particular, Alternative 2 would provide housing at densities and on a site identified in the Housing Element. However, Alternative 2 would not meet

the project objectives related to providing Medium-High Density Residential housing and providing affordable housing.

Environmental Analysis

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Project

Those impacts associated with clearing the project site would be the same as or similar to the impacts of the Project, because most of the site would require grading and/or excavation for building pads, roads, parking, landscaping and utilities. Alternative 2 would result in the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall building (DEIR Impacts 4.1-2 and 4.1-5), and would have the same potential to result in the loss of archaeological and paleontological resources (DEIR Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-3, 4.1-4 and 4.1-6). Similarly, the effects on protected species and oak trees would be similar (Initial Study Checklist Items IV. a and e).

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Project

None of the impacts would be less severe under Alternative 2.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Project

Alternative 2 would generate almost four times as many vehicle trips as the Project. Therefore, increases in traffic noise and the potential exposure to noise and would be greater because Alternative 2 would generate more traffic on local roads (Initial Study Checklist Item XII).

Because it would generate substantially more vehicle trips than the Project, Alternative 2 could have a more severe impact on traffic congestion. Traffic impacts under the Project would be less than significant because all intersections would operate at acceptable levels under existing and cumulative conditions. Alternative 2 could have the potential to cause one or more intersections to operate below LOS C, resulting in the need for mitigation.

Alternative 2 might exceed the screening threshold for greenhouse gas emissions. The PCAPCD has determined that GHG emissions below 1,100 MTCO_{2e} per year is “de minimis”, and does not require additional analysis or mitigation. The Project is estimated to generate 953.35 MTCO_{2e} per year (see Initial Study page 40), which would be about 13 percent below the screening threshold. With twice as many housing units and new commercial space, Alternative 2 would likely exceed the screening threshold, would require additional analysis to determine if its GHG emissions would be significant, and may require mitigation.

Rejection of Alternative 2

Although Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not result in impacts being less severe than the Project, and would in fact result in impacts being more severe than the Project. While Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within

walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City's commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion, and 2) Contribute toward the City's efforts to provide affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Alternative 2 is rejected.

Alternative 3: Retain Pleasure Hall Building/Increased Density

Description

Under this alternative, the existing historic Pleasure Hall building would be retained on site. The same number of residential units would be developed as for the Project, but they would be located within the 5.8-acre portion of the project site that is currently zoned for High Density Residential uses. A total of 64 single-family residences would be developed, resulting in a density of 11 units per acre, which would be consistent with the proposed Medium-High Density Residential designation. Every home would be two stories tall. Access would be provided by connections to Pacific Street and Grove Street. The layout of units would be similar to the Project, but lots and units would be somewhat smaller due to the higher density, and no residential units would be located adjacent to Pacific Street. Internal alleys would provide access to individual units.

Relationship of Alternative 3 to Project Objectives

This alternative would achieve most of the project objectives, because it would develop the same number of homes on the project site, although at a higher density than the Project.

Environmental Analysis

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Project

There are five oak trees on the 5.8-acre portion of the project site that would be removed under both Alternative 3 and the Project (Initial Study Item IV.e), so impacts on protected oak trees would be similar.

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Project

Under this alternative, the Pleasure Hall building would not be removed, so DEIR Impacts 4.1-2 and 4.1-5 would not occur. Impacts resulting from grading and excavation would be less severe, because the area of disturbance would be limited to the 5.8-acre portion of the project site. Therefore, the potential loss of archaeological and paleontological resources (DEIR Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-3, 4.1-4 and 4.1-5) and effects on protected bird species (Initial Study Item IV.a) would be reduced. However, because the majority of the project site would still be subject to grading and excavation, mitigation measures would still be required to protect these resources. The impact on protected bat species would not occur, because the existing Pleasure Hall building would not be demolished. Therefore, Initial Study Mitigation Measure IV-1(b) would not apply to Alternative 3.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Project

Alternative 3 would generate more traffic than the Project, because the 64 residential units would be in addition to the existing traffic generated by the commercial uses in the Pleasure Hall building. Assuming the trip generation rates provided in Table 3 of the traffic study, the approximately 13,000 square foot building could generate approximately 455 daily trips, 13 a.m. peak hour trips and 34 p.m. peak hour trips. When added to the traffic associated with the 64 residential units, the total number of trips under Alternative 3 would be 1,064 daily trips, 61 a.m. peak hour trips and 98 p.m. peak hour trips. As shown in the service level tables on pages 65, 66, 68 and 69 of the Initial Study, all intersections would operate at acceptable levels with the addition of project traffic, and there would be some capacity remaining at those intersections operating at LOS C. Alternative 3 would increase traffic levels at these intersections, and, depending on the distribution of trips, could cause one or more intersection to operate at LOS D, which would be a significant effect that would not occur under the Project, and would require mitigation.

Because of the increase in trips under Alternative 3, the traffic noise impacts would be more severe (Initial Study Checklist Item XII). Initial Study Mitigation Measures XII-1, -2 and -3 would be required of Alternative 3, as would additional analysis to determine if those measures alone would ensure that interior noise levels met City standards. If not, Alternative 3 would require some additional noise-attenuation to reduce the noise impact to a less-than-significant level.

Rejection of Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would avoid the loss of the historic Pleasure Hall, and reduce impacts on cultural resources and some biological resources primarily due to the reduction in ground disturbance. However, Alternative 3 would not achieve the project objectives of providing housing opportunities and/or contributing to the City's efforts to provide affordable housing as the Project, because only 64 units would be constructed and none would be reserved for low-income residents.

The Project as revised in the Final EIR would provide 74 units, ten more units than would be provided by Alternative 3. In addition, 7-8 of those units would be affordable. If 74 units were constructed on only 5.8 acres, it would not be as compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods

as the Project. It is not physically possible to build the 74 detached, single-family dwellings without these dwellings being three-story in height, rather than a standard two-story height, on 5.8 acres. Reducing the physical area to 5.8 acres to construct this number of dwelling units would require increasing the building height to accommodate the necessary square footage for a dwelling unit. This increased massing is not compatible with the adjoining neighborhood of existing one-story, single-family homes.

Additionally, there is not a market demand for three-story, detached single-family homes on the site. This site is located within the Racetrack/Tuttle/Winner's Circle residential neighborhood, which neighborhood consists of traditional one- and two-story homes that were built approximately 40 or more years ago. Across Grove Street from the project site is the Royal Oaks Mobile Home Park, which consists of one-story mobile homes. In this particular location, meeting market demand requires compatibility with the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. Two-story residential units on the site are compatible with the market and the neighborhood, whereas three-story residential units would not be so compatible. Thus, for market-related reasons, three-story detached single-family homes on this site are not feasible.

Alternative 4: Reduced Density with Similar Footprint

Description

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed at a lower density than the Project, resulting in a total of 40 single-family homes. At 5.4 units per acre, these units would be considered Medium Density Residential. Individual lots would be 6,000 to 7,000 square feet, and there would be a mixture of one- and two-stories homes. Lot coverage would be limited to 40 percent. Each residence would have two parking spaces, either both in a garage or one in a garage and the other in a carport or paved space.

The street system would be similar to the Project, except that existing oak trees would attempt to be avoided.

The existing Pleasure Hall building would be removed, but the existing trees surrounding the building would attempt to be retained in undeveloped areas. In addition, no residential lots would front Pacific Street.

Relationship of Alternative 4 to Project Objectives

Alternative 4 would achieve most of the project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the Project, because fewer units would be constructed and the housing density would be decreased, but no units would be constructed for low-income residents.

Environmental Analysis

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Project

Alternative 4 would remove the Pleasure Hall building, so the impact on historic resources (DEIR Impacts 4.1-2 and 4.1-5) would be identical to the Project. Alternative 4 would have similar potential impacts on archaeological (DEIR Impacts 4.1-1 and 4.1-4) and paleontological resources (DEIR Impacts 4.1-3 and 4.1-6) because the acreage that would be disturbed would be the same as the Project. Impacts on protected bat species would also be similar (Initial Study Item IV.a), because the existing Pleasure Hall building would be removed.

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Project

Alternative 4 would generate fewer vehicle trips than the Project, because fewer units would be developed. Consequently, traffic noise levels would be reduced. However, project trips are only a small portion of total traffic volumes on Pacific Street, so under Alternative 4 homes along Pacific Street could still be subjected to interior noise levels that exceed City standards (Initial Study Item XII). Therefore, Initial Study Mitigation Measures XII-1, -2 and -3 would still be required as would additional analysis to determine if the new subdivision configuration would meet the City’s interior noise level standards.

Impacts on oak trees (Item IV.e) would likely be avoided or reduced because of increased opportunities to locate improvements in areas away from the trees, so Initial Study Mitigation Measure IV-2 may not be required. Impacts on protected bird species (Initial Study Item IV.a) would be reduced due to the attempted retention of oak trees, although birds nesting near construction areas could still be disturbed. Therefore, Initial Study Mitigation Measure IV-1(a) would still be required.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Project

None of the impacts of Alternative 4 would be more severe than the Project impacts.

Rejection of Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would reduce some project impacts, but would not avoid the significant and unavoidable loss of the Pleasure Hall. While Alternative 4 would achieve some of the project objectives, it would not achieve the following project objectives: 1) Maximize development on a parcel with minimal natural resources; 2) Provide Medium-High Density Residential housing within walking and bicycling distance of downtown Rocklin and nearby retail commercial uses, and within a short driving distance to the City’s commercial centers at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 to promote walkable communities and reduce vehicle trips and traffic congestion; 3) Provide a project that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, including its guiding principles and strategies as they relate to smart land use, access and mobility and compact development; and 4) Contribute toward the City’s efforts to provide

affordable housing to low-income households. Therefore, Alternative 4 is rejected.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. In addition to the discussion and comparison of alternatives to the proposed project, CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected and the reasons for such selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least adverse impacts. CEQA Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

It should also be noted that environmental considerations are one portion of the factors that must be considered by the public and the decision makers in deliberations on the proposed project and alternatives. Other factors of importance include urban design, economics, social factors, legal requirements and fiscal considerations.

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development alternative, would be environmentally superior, because it would not remove the Pleasure Hall building, or have any impacts on cultural or biological resources, or result in exposure of residents to excessive noise. Of the other project alternatives, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to Alternatives 2 and 4 because it would retain the Pleasure Hall building, avoiding the only significant and unavoidable impact of the Project. The impacts on biological and other cultural resources would also be less severe due to the reduction in grading. Therefore, Alternative 3 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

As discussed above, the City rejects the Alternative 3 as infeasible because it would either not achieve, or achieve as well as the proposed project, the objectives of the proposed project. Alternative 3 would result in more traffic than the proposed project and might cause one or more project study intersections to operate at worse than Level of Service “C”. For these reasons and for those discussed above, and each of them individually, Alternative 3 is determined to be infeasible.

XV. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City adopts and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project, as discussed above, and the anticipated economic, social and other benefits of the Project.

The City finds and determines that: (i) the majority of the potentially significant impacts of the Project will be reduced to acceptable levels by the mitigation measures recommended in these Findings; (ii) the City's approval of the Project as proposed will result in certain significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures into the Project; and (iii) there are no other feasible mitigation measures or

other feasible Project alternatives that would further mitigate or avoid the remaining significant environmental effects. The significant effects that have not been mitigated to a less-than-significant level and are therefore considered significant and unavoidable are:

- 4.1-2 Loss of a historically significant building, and
- 4.1-5 Cumulative loss of historic resources.

In light of the environmental, social, economic and other considerations set forth below related to this Project, the City chooses to approve the Project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the Project substantially outweigh the Project's significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

The following statements identify the reasons why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects. The substantial evidence supporting the enumerated benefits of the Project can be found in the preceding findings, in the Project itself, and in the record of proceedings as defined herein, including the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the Project outweigh its significant adverse environmental effects and is an overriding consideration warranting approval.

The City finds that the Project would have the following economic, social, technological, and environmental benefits:

- 1. Consistency with the General Plan.** The project site is designated Mixed Use (MU) and High Density Residential (HDR) on the City of Rocklin General Plan land use map. The Project is requesting a General Plan Amendment from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such an entitlement would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with the City's General Plan.
- 2. Consistency with the City's Zoning Ordinance.** The project site is zoned Retail Business (C-2). The Project is requesting a Rezone and a General Development Plan from the City of Rocklin, and approval of such entitlements would ensure that development of the infill site would be consistent with City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3. Consistency with the General Plan EIR.** The General Plan EIR contemplates the environmental impacts of implementation of the General Plan land use designations, goals and policies, and identifies impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration. The General Plan EIR anticipated development of the project site with land uses that do not differ substantially from the Project's land uses. The Initial Study and DEIR for this Project, and these Findings, incorporate, either expressly or by reference, such impacts, mitigation measures and statements of overriding consideration that are applicable to the Project.
- 4. Compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.** The removal of those oak trees on site that have not been identified by the arborist as dead, diseased or dying will be mitigated by compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

5. General Plan Land Use Goals and Policies. The Project is consistent with and will advance the City's goals and policies for new residential developments as set forth in the City's General Plan, dated October 2012, including by way of example:

- a. Providing for an orderly and well-planned development that will enhance the City of Rocklin (General Land Use Goal, General Plan, p. 2-1);
- b. Promote flexibility and innovation in new development through the use of planned unit developments, development agreements, specific plans, mixed use projects, and other innovative design and planning techniques (LU-1, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- c. Encourage a variety of buildings sites, building types, and land use concepts in Medium High and High Density Residential, commercial, and industrial areas that are located along major streets, rights of way, and highways/freeways (LU-2, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- d. Utilize techniques that will minimize the adverse effects of light and glare on surrounding properties, and incorporate dark sky concepts to the extent practicable (LU-4, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- e. Encourage infill residential development that is in keeping with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, while providing a variety of densities and housing types as reflected by the zoning and land use designation of the infill property (LU-11, General Plan, p. 2-2);
- f. Provide a variety of residential land use designations that will meet the future needs of the City (LU-12, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- g. Encourage Medium High and High Density Residential uses to locate near major arterial and/or collector streets (LU-20, General Plan, p. 2-3);
- h. Maintain development standards unique to Central Rocklin that encourage residential development on infill parcels, including affordable housing, while maintaining compatibility with existing residential land uses (LU-21, General Plan p. 2-4);
- i. Adopt and implement land use strategies that utilize existing infrastructure, reduce the need for new roads, utilities, and other public works in newly developing areas, and enhance non-automobile transportation (LU-68, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- j. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, infill development and creative use of brownfield and under-utilized properties (LU-69, General Plan, p. 2-8);
- k. Increase densities in core areas to support public transit (LU-70, General Plan, p. 2-9);
and
- l. Promote greater linkage between land uses and transit, as well as other modes of transportation (LU-74, General Plan, p 2-9).

4. General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Goals and Policies. The Project is

consistent with and will advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the City's Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts on open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects (OCR-5, General Plan, p. 2-9);
- b. Require dedication of parkland, payment of in lieu fees for parkland, or a combination of both, as a condition of approval in the early stages of the development process, including approval of rezoning's, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of the goals and policies contained in this General Plan (OCR-13, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- c. Require new development to mitigate its impact on park development and maintenance (OCR-22, General Plan, p. 2-11);
- d. Mitigate for removal of oak trees and impacts to oak woodland in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, or for projects located in zones not directly addressed by the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance mitigation measures, on a project-by-project basis through the planning and entitlement process (OCR-43, General Plan, p. 2-13); and
- e. Minimize the degradation of water quality through the use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices (OCR-49, General Plan, p. 2-13);

5. General Plan Circulation Element Goals and Policies. The Project is consistent with and will advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to support transit services, NEV facilities and non-motorized transportation (C-2, General Plan, p. 2-15);
- b. Maintaining a minimum traffic Level of Service "C" for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below (C-10, General Plan, p. 2-16) within the study area; and
- c. Maintain street design standards for arterials, collectors and local streets (C-20, General Plan, p. 2-17).

6. General Plan Noise Element Goals and Policies. The Project is consistent with and will advance many of the goals and policies set forth in the Noise Element of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Emphasize site planning and project design to achieve the standards of this Noise Element. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise

standards; however, the construction of aesthetically intrusive wall heights shall be discouraged (N-2, General Plan, p. 2-23); and

- b. Restrict development of noise-sensitive land uses in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources that exceed the noise level standards contained within the Noise Element, unless the project design includes effective mitigation that results in noise exposure which meets noise standards (N-7, General Plan, p. 2-25).

7. General Plan Housing Element Goals and Policies. The Project is consistent with and will advance many of the goals and policies of the 2013-2021 Housing Element (Housing Element) of the General Plan, including, by way of example:

- a. Facilitate the provision of a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs to the community (Goal 2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- b. Provide quality housing opportunities for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels (Policy 2.1, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- c. Provide expanded housing opportunities for the community's workforce (Policy 2.2, Housing Element, p. 7-83);
- d. Encourage both the public and private sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing, with particular emphasis on housing affordable to lower income households, including extremely low income households, as well as housing suitable for seniors, large families, female-headed households, the homeless, and persons with disabilities. (Policy 2.3, Housing Element, p. 7-83); and
- e. Continue to work with developers requesting General Plan Amendments converting nonresidential designation to residential uses or from a higher density residential category to a lower density residential category to incorporate affordable housing as a component of the overall development. As an objective, target up to ten percent of the units as affordable, depending on the level of affordability or other amenities provided. Pursue the inclusion of extremely low income units in the negotiated target number of affordable units. (Policy 3.4, Housing Element, p. 7-84).

8. Consistency with Smart Growth Principles. The Project is generally consistent with commonly accepted principles of Smart Growth supporting the development of mixed-income communities; supporting a range of housing types as well as social diversity; promoting the use of existing infrastructure investments, and encouraging efficient land development and proximity to activity centers. This medium high-density residential project includes both market rate and affordable housing units. The Project is located adjacent to existing residential uses to the east and south, light industrial uses to the north, and a mobile home park and retail commercial uses to the west, and in the context of surrounding uses would be considered infill because it would develop a mostly vacant property surrounded by

existing development. The Project is located on existing community streets and includes new public streets to serve the new residences. The proximity of the Project to retail uses, schools and employment centers will encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian modes, and encourage the reduced reliance on the automobile as a travel mode. (American Planning Association (APA), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).)

- 9. Consistency with the SACOG Blueprint Project.** The Project is generally consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Project and would implement several of the growth principles of the Preferred Scenario adopted unanimously by the SACOG Board of Directors in December, 2004, including, by way of example, transportation choices, compact development, housing choice and diversity, use of existing assets and quality design (see “Blueprint Preferred Scenario” and “Blueprint Growth Principles”, SACOG Blueprint web page).
- 10. Revitalize an Underutilized Area of the City.** The Project will foster and facilitate the development of an underutilized site within the City that is surrounded by existing development. The underutilized site will be revitalized with economically beneficial uses, new buildings of quality architecture, landscape and hardscape design, and improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
- 11. Consistency with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.** The Project is generally consistent with the SACOG 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities, including its guiding principles and strategies related to smart land use, access, mobility and compact development.
- 12. Create Employment Opportunities for Local Residents.** The Project will have a positive impact on employment levels in the City by generating diversity in employment opportunities, including temporary construction jobs. The Project population will also generate demand for local goods and services, increasing economic activity in the City. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities and economic activity created by the Project.
- 13. Contribute to and Fund Needed Infrastructure Improvements.** The Project consists of new development that will be required to contribute to needed transportation infrastructure improvements by paying its fair share towards infrastructure improvements. The Project will also construct or contribute to funding other infrastructure improvements that will benefit additional development projects and City residents and visitors.
- 14. Increase Customer Base for Retail Activity.** The Project will provide additional residents to the City who will have disposable income to support the City's retailers and increase retail activity.
- 15. Generate Economic Benefits from Taxes.** The Project will provide increased sales tax and property tax revenue to the City, local schools and other agencies. These revenues will

benefit the City and other local governmental agencies, and their residents and constituencies, by providing needed revenue for the provision of required services and amenities. Specific to the City of Rocklin, these revenues will go to the City's General Fund, which is the primary source of funding for the construction, operation and maintenance of a number of essential City services, programs and facilities, including fire and police services, recreation programs, transit operations and administrative functions, among other things.

- 16. Expansion of the City's Housing Stock.** The Project will provide housing resources to meet the demands of a growing population of the south Placer County region, thereby helping to lessen upward pressure on housing costs.

XVI. CONCLUSION

The City has balanced these benefits and considerations against the potentially significant unavoidable environmental effects of the Project and has concluded that the impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing environmental impacts against Project benefits, the City has concluded that the benefits the City will derive from the Project, as compared to existing and planned future conditions, outweigh the risks. The City believes the Project benefits outlined above override the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the Project.

In sum, the City adopts the mitigation measures in the final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and finds that any residual or remaining effects on the environment resulting from the Project, identified as significant and unavoidable in the preceding Findings of Fact, are acceptable due to the benefits set forth in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.