TERRACINA AT WHITNEY RANCH PROJECT

Addendum No. 2 to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Final Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 99102012

Prepared for:

City of Rocklin
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

Prepared by:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
11 Natoma Street, Suite 155
Folsom, CA 95630

July 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project analyzed in the 2002 Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Final EIR (hereafter "2002 EIR") consists of a program that provides for the orderly and systematic development of lands around the City of Rocklin and provides the necessary public services to support the proposed suburban land uses. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project proposed to annex approximately 1,871 acres of land located within the City of Rocklin's Sphere of Influence (SOI) from Placer County. The annexed land would be developed and managed in accordance with a General Development Plan comprised of three geographic areas: Sunset Ranchos, the State Route (SR) 65 Corridor, and Parcel K. In general, the land would be developed with residential uses, business professional uses, commercial uses, light industrial uses, open space, parks, and schools. The 2002 EIR was certified on July 9, 2002 (City Council Resolution 2002-230).

Addendum No. 1 to the 2002 EIR was released in 2008 to address the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II Project, a component of the overall Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project located in northwest Rocklin. The Whitney Ranch Phase II Project consisted of a request for approval of a large lot tentative subdivision map that would divide the 641-acre site into 51 large parcels referred to as Units. A small lot tentative subdivision map was also being processed concurrently that would further subdivide most of the residentially designated Units into a total of 1,376 single-family residential lots. In 2019, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment was adopted, providing updated guidance for the development within the three geographic planning areas, including updated Development Units.

Since adoption of Addendum No. 1 to the Final EIR and Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment, additional changes related to the proposed development have been identified within the Sunset Ranchos geographic planning area. Such changes comprise the Terracina at Whitney Ranch Project (Revised Project), evaluated in this Addendum, Addendum No. 2 to the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project proposes to construct Development Unit No. 8 with a 288-unit affordable multi-family residential apartment project. The Revised Project would be affordable and restricted to extremely low, very low-, and low-income households. A density bonus of 54 units (23%) for a 288-unit affordable multi-family residential apartment project in the Planned Development-20 zone would be required to implement the Revised Project, in addition to design review of the site design, architecture, and landscaping. Further details of the Revised Project are provided below under *Project Description*.

The City of Rocklin. determined as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), that the Revised Project does not trigger the need for supplemental or subsequent review under Section 15162 of CEQA Guidelines, as detailed below. Therefore, the Revised Project is the subject of this Addendum, prepared pursuant to Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 requires either the Lead Agency or a Responsible Agency to prepare an Addendum to a certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent environmental document have occurred (refer to the discussion below regarding criteria described in Section 15162). The purpose of this Addendum is to document that no new significant impacts, nor a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, would result from the Project as described in this Addendum, relative to the project as analyzed in the 2002 EIR.

1.2 PURPOSE OF GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A General Development Plan is a planning document that defines, in detail, the development criteria for a project area. Chapter 17.60 of the Rocklin Municipal Code establishes the Planned Development process as a "means to provide for greater flexibility in environmental design than is provided under the strict application of the zoning and subdivision ordinances." With that intent, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan has been crafted to allow the integrated development of the 1,871-acre project in a manner that will a) promote the development of developable areas and avoid sensitive environmental areas, b) encourage creative and innovative design by allowing flexibility in property development standards, c) encourage the preservation of open space, and d) accommodate various types of large scale, complex and phased development in the planning area. More specifically, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan:

1. Establishes the interrelationship among land uses in the plan area.
2. Specifies permitted and conditionally permitted uses for all parcels and the intensity of the uses.
3. Establishes development standards such as the lot sizes, building setbacks, and height limits.
4. Identifies the width and general location of roadways necessary to serve the development.
5. Identifies the needs and supply sources of water, sewer, drainage, and other public service needs of the project.
6. Provides guidance for the preparation of tentative maps, with regards to design features such as street alignments and cross-sections, lot size and lot orientation.

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan serves as the regulatory land use document for the Northwest Rocklin area. All provisions of the Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Rocklin Municipal Code) apply to this project unless otherwise specified in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan.

1.3 PLAN AREA LOCATION

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project is approximately 1,871 acres located in the northwest corner of the City of Rocklin. Rocklin is located in the County of Placer, about 20 miles northeast of the City of Sacramento. The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area is contiguous to SR 65 on the west and the Twelve Bridges Specific Plan area in the City of Lincoln on the north. Within the City of Rocklin, the Whitney Oaks project is to the east with Sunset West and Stanford Ranch on the south. West of the plan area is the Sunset Industrial Area in the County of Placer.

As discussed above, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area contains three distinct geographic planning areas: Sunset Ranchos, SR 65 Corridor, and Parcel K. Sunset Ranchos is the largest of the three planning areas, occurring in the center of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area. Sunset Ranchos is 1,296.3 acres and contains Development Units 1 through 69. The SR 65 corridor is the next largest of the three planning areas and occurs within the west portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area. The SR 65 Corridor is 527.8 acres and contains Development Units 104, 105, 106, 107A-B, 108A-B, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113A-C, 114, 115, and 116. Parcel K is the

smallest of the three planning areas and occurs in the eastern portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area. Parcel K is 47 acres and is not divided into Development Units.

1.4 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

An Addendum to an EIR is appropriate under State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 for projects where there are no substantial changes to the project, or in circumstances surrounding the project, and where the project would not have new significant impacts or substantially more severe significant impacts than those disclosed in the previously certified EIR. Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines state that an Addendum to a previously certified EIR can be prepared for a project if the criteria summarized below are satisfied:

- **No Substantial Project Changes**. There are no substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

- **No Substantial Change in Circumstances**. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

- **No New Information of Substantial Importance**. There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known or could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, which shows any of the following: the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR; significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

An Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the adopted EIR. The decision-making body shall consider the Addendum with the adopted EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

None of the conditions identified in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) would occur with implementation of the Revised Project because:

a) The revisions to the Project evaluated in the 2002 EIR, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, of this Addendum, are relatively minor in nature and would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. The Revised Project increases the number of units permitted on site by 54 units (23%) from a maximum of 234 units to 288 units, which is an increase in density from 20 to 24.6 units per acre. The Revised Project proposes 288 multi-family residential units affordable to extremely low, very, and low-income households. The 2002 EIR, Addendum No. 1, and

Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment evaluated Development Unit 8 with fewer affordable units than proposed in the Revised Project. These revisions to the Project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts (refer to the *Environmental Analysis* section for details regarding the impacts associated with the Project revisions).

b) While some circumstances and existing conditions surrounding the Project have changed from those described in the 2002 EIR, the changes relate mostly to ongoing implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Existing conditions on and surrounding the project site generally remain as described in the 2002 EIR and are not substantially different from those described in that document. Therefore, any changes in circumstances or conditions that have occurred would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

c) There is no new information of substantial importance. There is no information available that indicates that the Project would result in significant effects that were not addressed in the previous EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or that mitigation measures or alternatives are available and feasible that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 2002 EIR ORIGINAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project analyzed in the 2002 EIR would provide for the orderly and systematic development of lands around the City of Rocklin and provide the necessary public services to support the proposed suburban land uses. The project proposed to annex approximately 1,871 acres of land located within the City of Rocklin's SOI from Placer County. Implementation of the project would result in 3,140 single-family dwelling units, 1,150 multi-family dwelling units, 32.5 acres of business professional uses, 164.4 acres of business professional/commercial uses, 96.6 acres of commercial uses, 187.9 acres of light industrial uses, 263.6 acres of open space, 55.6 acres of parks, and the designation of one high school and three elementary school sites. The annexed land would be developed and managed in accordance with a General Development Plan comprised of three geographic areas: Sunset Ranchos, SR 65 Corridor, and Parcel K. Each of these areas is described below.

The Sunset Ranchos community was proposed to consist of residential development with parks, school sites, open space, and commercial areas. The Sunset Ranchos site encompasses approximately 1,296 acres and was proposed for 3,009 single-family dwelling units, 1,150 multi-family dwelling units, one 50-acre high school site, three 10-acre elementary schools, 55.6 acres of parks, 194.2 acres of open space, 33.9 acres of commercial sites, and 9.6 acres of business professional uses. The SR 65 Corridor area would consist of business professional, commercial, light industrial, and open space uses. Development of Parcel K would consist of low and medium density residential housing, and open space. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would amend the City's General Plan to apply specific land use designations to the project area, pre-zone the area as "Planned Development", and create a General Development Plan that would provide specific detail regarding implementation of the Planned Development consistent with the General Plan land use designations. The elements of the annexation, General Plan amendment, pre-zoning, and General Development Plan were evaluated in the 2002 EIR.

2.2 ADDENDUM NO. 1

The Whitney Ranch Phase II Project evaluated in Addendum No. 1 to the Final EIR was comprised of 641 acres within the Sunset Ranchos planning area of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. The project requested for approval of a large lot tentative subdivision map that would divide the 641-acre site into 51 Units. The project also requested a small lot tentative subdivision map that would further subdivide most of the residentially designated Units into a total of 1,376 single-family residential lots. The Whitney Ranch Phase II Project also included construction of on-site streets, public pedestrian and bicycle trails, landscaping, fencing, water, sewer, and storm drainage facilities, utilities (including telephone, electrical, and natural gas lines), storm water detention areas, off-site sewer improvements, and the off-site widening of West Oaks Boulevard.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II Project would differ from the 2002 EIR by reducing the development of residential units by approximately 60 homes and increasing open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses would increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses would be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the 2002 EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including major streets, would remain unchanged. The existing boundaries for developable areas would remain the same except for one small change in the former Unit 37. As such, the Whitney Ranch Phase II Project

generally consisted of renumbering of Units and adjustments to land use designations, densities, and development standards at various locations throughout the General Development Plan.

Associated entitlements included an Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit to address the proposed removal of oak trees, a General Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment to reflect renumbering of Units, and adjustments to land use designations, densities, and development standards and various locations throughout the project. The final entitlement request consisted of approval of architectural and landscaping Design Review for single-family residential homes on proposed lots that are less than 6,000 square feet (sf) in area.

2.3 GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

As discussed above, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment was adopted in 2019 and provides updated guidance for the development within the three geographic planning areas. The 2019 Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment serves as the most recent guidance for future development. The Amendment also includes updated Development Units, as listed above under Section 1.3 of this Addendum.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF REVISED PROJECT

2.4.1 Project Setting

USA Properties Fund, Inc. (Applicant) proposes the Terracina at Whitney Ranch, an affordable 288-unit rental apartment community between University Avenue and Wildcat Boulevard in northwest Rocklin; refer to the attached site plan. The Project site is east of University Avenue and west of Wildcat Boulevard, approximately one-quarter mile north of Whitney Ranch Parkway. The Project site consists of APN 017-172-014-000. USA Properties Fund, Inc. owns the property. The 11.7-acre (gross) and 11.0-acre (net) Project site is roughly rectangular in shape and vacant. Roadway frontage improvements have been constructed on University Avenue and Wildcat Boulevard, and landscaping improvements are complete on the Wildcat Boulevard frontage. A 12-inch diameter sewer main and a paved sewer access road traverse the southcentral portion of the site from west to east. The site was previously rough-graded, and on-site vegetation consists of sparse grasses.

An open space corridor is south of the site, and the 171-unit Montessa at Whitney Ranch Apartment community is further south, north of Whitney Ranch Parkway. Whitney Ranch High School is across the street from the site, east of Wildcat Boulevard. The 156-unit Whitney Ranch Apartment community is north of the Revised Project, south of Ranch View Drive. University Drive is on the west side of the site, and business professional and commercial uses are planned further west between Highway 65 and University Avenue.

The site's General Plan designation is High-Density Residential (HDR), with a density range of 15.5 units and greater per acre. The site is zoned Planned Development-20 units per acre (PD-20). Apartments are consistent with the General Plan designation and permitted in the PD-20 zone. The site is Development Unit 8 in the Northwest Rocklin Area General Development Plan.

2.4.2 Entitlement Request

The following entitlements are requested to implement the Revised Project:

- Density bonus of 54 units (23%) for a 288-unit affordable multi-family residential apartment Project in the Planned Development-20 zone; and

- Design Review of the site design, architecture, and landscaping for a 288-unit affordable multi-family residential Project.

2.4.2.1 Density Bonus

The Revised Project includes a request for a density bonus, consistent with California Government Code (GC) Sections 65915 - 65918. The Revised Project will be 100% affordable and restricted to extremely low, very low-, and low-income households. The Revised Project is eligible for an 80% density bonus because all units (other than manager units) would be restricted to extremely low, very low-, and low-income households (GC Section 65915(f)(3)(D)(i)).

Under the PD-20 zoning designation, the 11.7-acre site has a density of 20 units per acre and would yield a maximum of 234 units. A density bonus of 54 units (23%) is requested for a total of 288 units.

		Units
Units Under PD-20 Zoning	11.7 acres x 20 units/acre	234
Density Bonus Units	54 units/234 units = 23%	54
Revised Project		288

GC Section 65915(d)(2)(D) allows projects that are 100% affordable four incentives or concessions. Incentives or concessions are defined as:

- A reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning code or architectural design requirements, such as a reduction in setback or minimum square footage requirements; or,

- Approval of mixed-use zoning; or,

- Other regulatory incentives or concessions which actually result in identifiable and actual cost reductions.

As described below, a concession is requested to allow a 35-foot, three-story building in the PD-20 zone.

2.4.3 Revised Project Components

The Revised Project is a rental apartment community with 288 units, indoor and outdoor amenities, parking, and landscaping. A mix of one, two, and three-bedroom units are in twelve rectangular three-story buildings arranged around the site. A clubhouse, pool, and other outdoor amenities are interior to the site and screened from adjacent roadways by apartment buildings located on the site's perimeter. The total building area is 269,962 sf, and the site coverage is 19.1%. A small maintenance storage building (192 sf) is planned adjacent to a drive aisle in the southeast portion of the site. The Revised Project will include three units for managers.

2.4.3.1 Residential Units

The Revised Project will include a mix of one, two, and three-bedroom apartment homes ranging from 583 to 1,034 sf. Four floorplans include a full kitchen, living space, bedroom(s), bathroom(s), indoor storage, and outdoor storage.

Unit Type	Bedrooms/Baths	Unit Area	Number of Units
1-1	1 bedroom/1 bath	583 sf	74 units
2-1	2 bedroom/2 bath	820 sf	72 units
2-2	2 bedroom/2 bath	899 sf	72 units
3-1	3 bedroom/2 bath	1,034 sf	70 units
			288 units

2.4.3.2 Affordable Housing

Of the 288 units, 285 units will be rental units affordable to low, very low, and extremely low-income households with incomes ranging from 30% to 70% of area median income (AMI). Three unrestricted units will be manager units. The approximate distribution of affordable units in the Revised Project will be:

Income Category	Income	Number of Affordable Units	Percentage of Units
Extremely Low Income	30% of AMI	30 units	10%
Very Low Income	50% of AMI	74 units	26%
Low Income	60% of AMI	74 units	26%
Low Income	70% of AMI	107 units	38%
		285 units	100%

AMI = Area Median Income

Affordable rental units, maximum incomes, and maximum rents will be restricted for a 55-year term in a recorded affordability restriction. The Revised Project assists the City in meeting its housing goals and obligations under the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

2.4.3.3 Amenities

Community amenities include a 4,186± sf single-story clubhouse/amenity building near the center of the site with a clubroom with lounge areas, large-screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, laundry facilities, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities feature a swimming pool, tot lot with play equipment, and outdoor patio with seating and barbeque picnic areas adjacent to the clubhouse and pool area. A small courtyard with seating, small patio, and a barbeque area is planned north of the clubhouse between two apartment buildings, and a small, fenced dog park with synthetic turf is planned near the south property line.

2.4.3.4 Design Concept

The Revised Project design is consistent with the City Design Review Guidelines and the University Architectural District Guidelines. The Revised Project's design concept consists of a contemporary style of rectilinear forms projecting in multiple planes. The buildings feature strong forms with alternating

building materials (stone veneer, stucco, and fiber cement lap siding, metallics) that create shadowing and depth. Stone veneer framed building entries make focal points.

The body finish will be a concrete plaster system with scored construction joints that create an irregular grid along with the pattern of window grids and horizontal siding. Varying flat rooflines create interest in the massing and form of the three-story buildings. Two color schemes (ivory, brown, bronze, and gray, artichoke, oakmoss) will be used on the two building types. Metal railings on balconies, perforated metal panels, and light fixtures create visual interest. The building elevations complement adjacent uses and offer architectural interest along Wildcat Boulevard and University Avenue.

2.4.3.5 Building Height

The maximum building height will range from28’3 to the roofline and 34’10” to the parapet. Parapets will screen the building-attached mechanical equipment and most of the rooftop photovoltaic panels from ground view. The proposed building height is three stories.

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan (NWRGDP) (Ordinance 1121) Table 9 identifies the maximum building height within the PD-20 zoning district of 35 feet and the Revised Project is consistent with the standard. Rocklin Municipal Code (RMC) Section 17.70.020.A.2 requires a conditional use permit for residential buildings greater than thirty feet or with more than two stories. As one of the concessions under the density bonus, the building height of 35 feet and three stories is requested.

2.4.3.6 Landscape Concept

The Revised Project will install landscape improvements on the University Avenue frontage. The landscape concept is water-efficient, low maintenance, and will complement the buildings and make a positive contribution to the site’s overall aesthetics. Low-profile shrubs, including screening shrubs, are planned along with shade and canopy trees. The planting design features various Mediterranean-style, native, drought-tolerant, and fire-resistant species to create layers of color and texture to complement the architectural style and setting. HVAC units will be roof-mounted and screened from sight to create more areas for landscaping.

2.4.3.7 Access and Circulation

Vehicular access to the Revised Project will be from a driveway on University Avenue. Drive aisles (26-foot width) will provide internal access throughout the site. A gated emergency vehicle access (EVA), planned in the southeast corner of the site, is aligned with the high school drive east of Wildcat Boulevard.

Accessible pedestrian paths are planned around the buildings to provide a walking route for residents. Paths will connect to sidewalks on University Avenue and Wildcat Boulevard.

2.4.3.8 Parking

The Revised Project requires 396 parking spaces (1.4 spaces per unit) under the State density bonus law and 612 spaces (2.1 spaces/unit) under Rocklin Zoning Code Section 17.66.020.

		State Density Bonus Law Govt Code 65915(p)(1)		Rocklin Zoning Code 17.66.020	
Unit Type	Units	Parking Ratio	Spaces Required	Parking Ratio	Spaces Required
1 Bedroom	72	1 space/unit	72	1.5 space/unit	108
2 Bedroom	144	1.5 spaces/unit	216	2 spaces/unit	288
3 Bedroom	72	1.5 spaces/unit	108	2 spaces/unit	144
Guest	-	-	-	0.25 space/unit	72
Total	288		396		612
Spaces/Unit			1.4		2.1

The Revised Project includes 550 parking spaces in surface parking areas proximate to buildings, including 288 covered carport spaces and 262 uncovered spaces (43 compact and 219 standard) for residents and guests. The parking provided ratio is 1.9 spaces per unit, of which one space per unit is carport covered. The Revised Project's parking ratio is between the ratios of the State density bonus law (1.4 spaces per unit) and the Zoning Ordinance (2.1 spaces per unit). Ten percent of parking spaces will be electric vehicle charging station capable. The proposed parking ratio of 1.9 spaces per unit is comparable to the parking supply at other apartment communities owned and managed by USA Properties. Bicycle parking is planned throughout the site adjacent to apartment buildings.

2.4.3.9 Sustainability Features

The Revised Project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The Revised Project provides electric vehicle charging spaces consistent with CALGreen. The position of some of the buildings in a north-south orientation maximizes passive solar access and natural lighting. A photovoltaic system on carports and rooftops will benefit the community.

2.4.3.10 Fencing

An open fence constructed with the Whitney Ranch Apartments is located on the north property line. A six-foot black open fencing (tube steel) is planned on the Wildcat Boulevard frontage and the south property line. An open view fence is not proposed on the University Blvd frontage because on-street parking is not permitted on University Boulevard and no fence is included on the apartment community north of the Revised Project. The pool and tot lot will be enclosed by six-foot and three-foot open fences.

2.4.3.11 Signage

One freestanding community-identification monument sign is proposed on the University Avenue frontage, north of the driveway. Monument sign building materials and colors complement the Revised Project design style and color palette.

2.4.3.12 Refuse Collection

Trash enclosures throughout the site are within a short distance of each unit. Trash enclosures, designed to accommodate trash and recycling dumpsters, will be constructed of tan split-face concrete masonry units and metal doors painted to match the building color schemes.

2.4.3.13 Utilities and Services

Sewer and water service will be extended into the site from existing stubs on University Avenue and Wildcat Boulevard. The 20-foot sewer easement that traverses the site is accessible within an east-west drive aisle. Drainage and stormwater quality for the site is addressed in the Northwest Rocklin Annexation project Drainage Master Plan.

2.4.3.14 Project Construction

Site grading will occur in one phase and approximately 10,000 cubic yards of material will be moved, with no import or export of material. The Revised Project will be graded and constructed in a single phase and take approximately fourteen months to complete.

2.4.3.15 Project Ownership and Management

The Revised Project will be owned and managed by USA Properties Fund, Inc. USA Properties has developed, constructed, or rehabilitated more than 12,000 family and senior apartments in approximately 90 communities throughout California and Nevada. USA Properties owns and manages over thirty apartment communities in the Sacramento region. Three residential units for managers will be included in the Revised Project.

2.4.3.16 Social Programming

USA Properties partners with LifeSTEPS to provide social support services to residents, including educational classes, after-school programs, employment coaching, financial literacy, and mediation services. LifeSTEPS and USA Properties award scholarships and grants from the JB Brown Fund for resident education and skill training. The program also provides financial assistance for residents in crisis.

2.5 PREVIOUSLY DISCLOSED IMPACTS

As disclosed in the 2002 EIR, implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project will result in **significant but mitigable** (to less than significant levels) impacts on geology, soils and seismicity; land use; public safety and hazards; and public services. **Significant and unavoidable** impacts to air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; hydrology, water quality and flooding; noise; public utilities; transportation/circulation; and visual resources were also identified. Population, employment and housing was also analyzed in detail in the 2002 EIR; however, the project was determined to have a **less than significant** impact on this issue area, with no mitigation required. Agricultural resources and mineral resources were identified during the initial environmental review process (prior to the preparation of the 2002 EIR) as having no potential for impacts and, thus, were **not examined in detail** in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, energy and wildfire were added as environmental issue areas after the release of the 2002 EIR, and therefore were not discussed in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would not result in changes to any of the prior conclusions, as described below under *Environmental Analysis*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Addendum to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) EIR (2002 EIR) includes the following analysis to demonstrate that environmental impacts associated with the Revised Project are consistent with those disclosed in the 2002 EIR.

3.1 AESTHETICS

3.1.1 Summary of Aesthetics Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR found that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in a significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact due to substantially altering the existing visual character of the site. Development of the project would result in the conversion of grassland and open space to developed, urban area. However, proposed residential development was determined to be typical of the residential development in the adjacent areas in Rocklin, and the project would not affect scenic highways. The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan would help new development integrate with existing residential areas by containing policies guiding visual quality of future structures. The project would preserve areas of open space and open space corridors. Trees and landscaping would also be incorporated to enhance the visual quality of the site. Impacts related to constructing a development that is considered visually incompatible with surrounding uses would be less than significant. However, impacts related to substantially altering the existing visual character of the site would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was also found to result in significant impacts related to altering lighting in the area. The proposed development would include new sources of nighttime lighting that would be substantially greater than existing conditions and could interfere with neighboring properties. Additionally, construction of stadiums and ballparks would require large light fixtures that would substantially increase nighttime lighting in surrounding areas. The 2002 EIR included a required measure requiring the project applicant to ensure that roadway streetlights on the project site adhere to the City of Rocklin light standards. The 2002 EIR also includes Mitigation Measure MMM-3(a), which would reduce lighting impacts from proposed commercial properties to below a level of significance. Mitigation Measure MMM-3(b) would reduce lighting impacts from stadiums and ballparks, but such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The project was found to not substantially increase glare, and impacts related to glare would be less than significant.

3.1.2 Aesthetics Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The changes proposed by the Revised Project would increase the residential density within Development Unit No. 8 from 20.0 to 24.6 units per acre. Increasing the maximum units on the site by 54 units (23%) would not result in new significant aesthetic impacts greater than those identified in the 2002 EIR. Although the Revised Project would increase the density of the proposed development, the proposed residences would still be designed and constructed to match the visual character of surrounding developments and the project is designed consistent with the University District Design Guidelines and the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan development standards. The Revised Project would still occur within the boundaries of Development Unit No. 8 and would not interfere with any scenic corridors or scenic highways. Additionally, although the Revised Project would result in an increase in nighttime lighting at the site, the proposed increase in density would not significantly worsen

lighting impacts over what was identified in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would incorporate the aesthetics required measure listed in the 2002 EIR requiring the applicant to ensure roadway streetlights on the site adhere to the City of Rocklin light standards. Therefore, aesthetics impacts would be less than significant, and the Revised Project would not result in more significant aesthetics impacts than what was evaluated in the 2002 EIR.

3.1.3 Aesthetics Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures MMM-3(a) and MMM-3(b) from the 2002 EIR would not be applicable to the Revised Project, and are therefore not provided below. The required Mitigation Measure REQ-MM for roadway streetlights is listed below. Because impacts to aesthetics would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall ensure that roadway streetlights on the project site adhere to the City of Rocklin light standards.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

3.2.1 Summary of Agriculture and Forestry Resources Impacts from 2004 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not contain an agricultural resources chapter; however, potential impacts to agricultural resources resulting from implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project were analyzed within the Land Use chapter. As discussed in the 2002 EIR, although the Sunset Ranchos portion of the site was designated for Residential-Agriculture by the Placer County General Plan, this region was not being used for agricultural uses. The City of Rocklin adopted Planning Reserve and Light Industrial land use designations for the region.

The 2002 EIR determined that no parcels within the project were under a Williamson Act contract, so a conflict with a Williamson Act contract would not occur. Additionally, the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program had not identified any Prime, Unique, or Important Farmlands within the project area. No agricultural uses existed within the project area, with the exception of seasonal livestock grazing within Parcel K. As determined by the California Department of Conservation, soils within Grazing Land are not suitable for growing crops. Significant impacts to agriculture and forestry resources would not occur with implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, and no mitigation was required.

3.2.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources Impacts Associated with Revised Project

Implementation of the Revised Project would occur within the boundaries of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project area, which is not considered as prime farmland or agricultural lands, zoned for agricultural use or forest land, or under a Williamson Act contract. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation, the Revised Project site is classified as Grazing Land and does not contain any Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (California Department of Conservation 2018). The Revised Project site does not contain agricultural or forest land, and is not used or zoned for agricultural or timberland production. Implementation of the Revised Project would not result in significant impacts related to agriculture and

forestry resources. Impacts are consistent with the findings for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project evaluated in the 2002 EIR.

3.2.3 Agriculture and Forestry Resources Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to agriculture and forestry resources would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

3.3.1 Summary of Air Quality Impacts from 2002 EIR

Construction of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to generate criteria air pollutants that would exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) thresholds, resulting in significant impacts. The 2002 EIR included three required measures to help lower such emissions, including requiring the applicant to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, the Uniform Building Code, and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The 2002 EIR also included Mitigation Measures GMM-1(a) and GMM-1(b) to minimize construction emissions. However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Operation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to result in significant generation of both vehicle and area source air pollutants, increasing total air pollutant emissions. The 2002 EIR identified five required measures to minimize the release of pollutants during operation, including the three required measures discussed above. The required measures also required that only United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) certified woodstoves shall be installed, the project shall comply with all Environmental Protection Agency regulations to wood burning stoves, and the project shall comply with all federal EPA mandated requirements. The 2002 EIR also included Mitigation Measures GMM-2(a) through GMM-2(g) to further reduce operational emissions. However, operational emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to increasing carbon monoxide (CO) at some intersections and potentially exposing sensitive receptors to stationary source pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs). Therefore, mitigation is not required for these issues. However, the required measures discussed above would still be incorporated.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with other cumulative development, was found to potentially hinder the PCAPCD's ability to bring the region into attainment for ozone (O_3) and particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}). Implementation of Mitigation Measure GMM-5, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measures GMM-1 and GMM-2, would reduce impacts, but such cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Potential cumulative impacts related to increasing CO concentrations at some intersections was found to be less than significant, and mitigation was not required.

3.3.2 Air Quality Impacts Associated with Revised Project

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis was prepared to analyze potential air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impacts resulting from implementation of the Revised Project (Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021). As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact

Analysis, implementation of the Revised Project would contribute to local emissions in the area during both construction and operation. Construction and operational emissions were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0 software. Modeling assumptions are provided in the technical report, and the estimated emissions are provided below.

3.3.2.1 Construction Emissions

During construction of the Revised Project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate on the site. Construction-related emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction workers' commute, and construction material hauling for the entire construction period. The aforementioned activities would involve the use of diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment that would generate emissions of criteria pollutants. The Revised Project construction activities also represent sources of fugitive dust, which includes particulate matter (PM) emissions. As construction of the proposed project would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants, including reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and PM_{10}, intermittently within the site and in the vicinity of the site, until all construction has been completed, construction is a potential concern, as the proposed project is located in a nonattainment area for ozone and PM. Estimated unmitigated construction-related emissions for the existing land use designation scenario and the Revised Project are presented in Table 1, *Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions*.

Table 1
Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions (lbs/day)

	ROG	NO_X	PM_{10}
Revised Project	14.49	38.89	11.00
PCAPCD Significance Threshold	**82.0**	**82.0**	**82.0**
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**
Source: Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021			

As shown in Table 1, the Revised Project's construction-related emissions would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance for ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}. Additionally, PM_{10} emissions would be further reduced through compliance with PCAPCD Rule 228, which requires projects involving earth-disturbing activities to implement various dust control measures, such as minimizing track-out on to paved public roadways, limiting vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces to 15 miles per hour (mph), and stabilization of storage piles and disturbed areas. Given the Revised Project's compliance with PCAPCD Rule 228, construction-related emissions of PM_{10} would likely be lower than the levels presented within Table 1.

Because the Revised Project's estimated unmitigated construction emissions of ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10} would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance, construction activities associated with development of the Revised Project would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone. Accordingly, construction of the Revised Project would not violate any ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and a less-than-significant impact would occur. Still, although impacts would be less than significant, Mitigation Measures GMM-1(a) and GMM-1(b) from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project.

3.3.2.2 Operational Emissions

Operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10} would be generated by the Revised Project from both mobile and stationary sources. Day-to-day activities, such as the future resident vehicle trips to and from the site, would make up the majority of the mobile emissions. Emissions would also occur from area sources such as natural gas combustion from heating mechanisms, landscape maintenance equipment exhaust, and consumer products (e.g., deodorants, cleaning products, spray paint, etc.).

The maximum unmitigated operational emissions for the existing land use designation scenario and the Revised Project are presented in Table 2, *Maximum Unmitigated Operational Emissions*. As shown in the table, the operational emissions from the Revised Project would be below the PCAPCD's thresholds of significance for ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}.

Table 2
Maximum Unmitigated Operational Emissions (lbs/day)

	ROG	NO_X	PM_{10}
Revised Project	20.65	9.36	20.17
PCAPCD Significance Threshold	**55.0**	**55.0**	**82.0**
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**
Source: Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021			

Therefore, operation of the Revised Project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone or PM. Accordingly, operations of the Revised Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and a less-than-significant impact would occur. Still, although impacts would be less than significant, Mitigation Measures GMM-2(a) and (b) and GMM-2(d) through (g), from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and would be implemented. Mitigation Measure GMM-2(c) specifically relates to commercial development and, therefore, is not applicable to the Revised Project.

3.3.2.3 Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others, due to the types of population groups or activities involved. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and/or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Sensitive receptors are typically defined as facilities where sensitive receptor population groups (i.e., children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill) are likely to be located. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. The nearest existing sensitive receptors would be the multi-family residences located approximately 30 feet north of the Revised Project site. Additionally, Whitney High School is located approximately 250 feet east of the site. The major pollutant concentrations of concern are localized CO emissions and TAC emissions, which are addressed in further detail below.

Localized CO Emissions

Localized concentrations of CO are related to the levels of traffic and congestion along streets and at intersections. Traffic congestion near a roadway's intersection with vehicles moving slowly or idling could result in localized CO emissions at that intersection due to a vehicle engine's inefficient combustion. High levels of localized CO concentrations are only expected where background levels are high, and traffic volumes and congestion levels are high. Accordingly, a land use project could result in impacts associated with localized CO concentrations at roadway intersections if the project generates substantial traffic.

The PCAPCD has established screening methodology for localized CO emissions, which are intended to provide a conservative indication of whether project-generated vehicle trips would result in the generation of localized CO emissions that would contribute to an exceedance of AAQS and potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations. Per the PCAPCD's screening methodology, if the project would result in vehicle operations producing less than 550 pounds per day of CO emissions, the project would not result in localized CO emissions that would violate CO standards.

According to the modeling performed for the Revised Project, operation of the Revised Project would result in maximum mobile source CO emissions of 136.28 pounds per day (Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021). Consequently, CO emissions related to operation of the Revised Project would be far below the 550 pounds per day screening threshold used by PCAPCD. Therefore, according to the PCAPCD's screening methodology for localized CO emissions, the Revised Project would not be expected to generate substantial concentrations of localized CO emissions. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

TAC Emissions

Another category of environmental concern is TACs. The California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (Handbook) provides recommended setback distances for sensitive land uses from major sources of TACs, including, but not limited to, freeways and high traffic roads, gas stations, chrome plating operations, distribution centers, and rail yards. The CARB has identified diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC; thus, high volume freeways, stationary diesel engines, and facilities attracting heavy and constant diesel vehicle traffic are identified as having the highest associated health risks from DPM. Health risks associated with TACs are a function of both the concentration of emissions and the duration of exposure, where the higher the concentration and/or the longer the period of time that a sensitive receptor is exposed to pollutant concentrations would correlate to a higher health risk.

The Revised Project would not involve any land uses or operations that would be considered major sources of TACs, including DPM. As such, the Revised Project would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations.

However, short-term, construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, primarily DPM, from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. Although DPM emissions from on-road haul trucks would be widely dispersed throughout the Revised Project site and surrounding vicinity as haul trucks move goods and material to and from the site, exhaust from off-road equipment would primarily occur within the Revised Project site. As noted previously, the nearest sensitive receptors are located approximately 30 feet north of the site. Consequently, the operation of

off-road equipment within the site during construction could result in exposure of nearby residents to DPM.

PCAPCD has established significance criteria for local community risk and hazard impacts as a result of new sources of TACs. The PCAPCD's thresholds for analyzing health risks from new sources of emissions are presented below:

- The cancer risk would be greater than 10 per million persons; or,
- The hazard index would be greater than 1.

Although the Revised Project would not involve the siting or operation of any permanent sources of TACs, in the absence of specific thresholds for use when analyzing health risks from short-term projects, the foregoing PCAPCD thresholds are applied to the Revised Project, for construction specifically.

Buildout of the site with 234 units has already been approved and evaluated in the 2002 EIR. As a result, this analysis includes an evaluation of the potential increase in health risk associated with the 54-unit Density Bonus. The health risk was calculated for both the Approved Buildout conditions (234 units) as well as the proposed project (288 units), and the net change in health risk was compared to the PCAPCD's thresholds of significance.

To analyze potential health risks to the nearby residents and high school that could result from DPM emissions from off-road equipment at the project site, total DPM emissions from the Revised Project construction were estimated. The methodology is provided in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021). The estimated construction emissions are provided in Table 3, *Maximum Unmitigated Cancer Risk and Hazard Index Associated with Revised Project Construction DPM*, below.

Table 3
Maximum Unmitigated Cancer Risk and Hazard Index Associated with Revised Project Construction DPM

	Cancer Risk (per million persons)	Acute Hazard Index	Chronic Hazard Index
Approved Buildout	21.26	0.00	0.02
Proposed Project	21.54	0.00	0.02
Net Difference	*+0.28*	*0.00*	*0.00*
Thresholds of Significance	10.00	1.00	1.00
Exceed Thresholds?	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021

As shown in Table 3**Table** , construction of the Revised Project would not result in acute or chronic hazards in excess of PCAPCD's standards. However, construction would conservatively have the potential to result in cancer risks in excess of PCAPCD's 10 cases per million threshold. However, the net difference in cancer risk emissions of the Revised Project as compared to the approved buildout of the project site would be less than the 10 persons per million. Because the net increase in health risk associated with construction of the Revised Project would be below the applicable PCAPCD threshold, the Revised Project would not result in a significant increase in health risk beyond what could have

occurred pursuant to the uses analyzed in the 2002 EIR for the site. Additionally, the Revised Project would adhere to the City of Rocklin's air quality conditions of approval, provided under Section 3.3.3 of this Addendum, to minimize impacts. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

Criteria Pollutants

Since adoption of the 2002 EIR, the California Supreme Court (Sierra Club v. County of Fresno 6 Cal.5th 502) has underscored the need for analysis of potential health impacts resulting from emission of criteria pollutants during implementation of a project. Although analysis of project-level health risks related to the emission of TACs and other localized pollutants has long been practiced under CEQA, the analysis of health impacts due to individual projects resulting from emissions of criteria pollutants is a relatively new field. Whereas health impacts related to emissions of TACs are geographically limited and can fairly easily be traced back to a single project, health risks related to criteria pollutants occur as a result of cumulative regional-scale emissions.

The PCAPCD's thresholds of significance were established based on the applicable AAQS, which are health-based standards designed to ensure safe levels of criteria pollutants that avoid specific adverse health effects. Because the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) is designated as nonattainment for State and federal eight-hour ozone and State PM_{10} standards, the PCAPCD, along with other air districts in the SVAB region, has adopted federal and state attainment plans to demonstrate progress towards attainment of the AAQS. Full implementation of the attainment plans would ensure that the AAQS are attained and sensitive receptors within the SVAB are not exposed to excess concentrations of criteria pollutants. In summary, the PCAPCD's thresholds of significance were established with consideration given to the health-based air quality standards established by the AAQS, and are designed to aid the district in implementing the applicable attainment plans to achieve attainment of the AAQS. Thus, if a project's criteria pollutant emissions exceed the PCAPCD's mass emission thresholds of significance, a project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the PCAPCD's air quality planning efforts, thereby delaying attainment of the AAQS. Because the AAQSs are representative of safe levels that avoid specific adverse health effects, a project's hinderance of attainment of the AAQS could be considered to contribute towards regional health effects associated with the existing nonattainment status of ozone and PM_{10} standards.

The 2002 EIR did not explicitly address health hazards related to criteria pollutant exposure. However, the 2002 EIR concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur related to emissions of criteria pollutants and, therefore, implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could contribute towards regional health effects associated with the existing nonattainment status of ozone and PM_{10} standards. As discussed above, the Revised Project, when evaluated individually, would not result in exceedance of the PCAPCD's thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions. Because the PCAPCD's thresholds of significance were established with consideration given to the health-based air quality standards established by the AAQS, implementation of the Revised Project would not result in adverse health hazards. Impacts resulting from the Revised Project would be lower than those identified in the 2002 EIR.

3.3.2.4 Pollutants of Principal Concern

Emissions of pollutants have the potential to adversely affect sensitive receptors within the Revised Project area. Pollutants of principal concern include emissions leading to odors, emissions of dust, or

emissions considered to constitute air pollutants. Air pollutants have been discussed above. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on emissions of odors and dust during construction and operation of the Revised Project.

Odors

Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. The Revised Project would not include any such uses, and residential projects are not typically associated with the generation of unpleasant odors during operation.

Diesel fumes from construction equipment and heavy-duty trucks could be found to be objectionable; however, as addressed above, operation of construction equipment would be regulated by PCAPCD rules and regulations, and would occur intermittently throughout the course of a day. All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the statewide In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. In addition, construction activities would be restricted to certain hours per the City's Construction Noise Guidelines. Overall, construction is temporary, construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day, and construction would likely only occur over portions of the improvement area at a time. For the aforementioned reasons, the Revised Project would not result in any noticeable objectionable odors associated with construction.

In addition, PCAPCD Rule 205, Nuisance, addresses the exposure of "nuisance or annoyance" air contaminant discharges, including odors, and provides enforcement of odor control. Rule 205 is complaint-based, where if public complaints are sufficient to cause the odor source to be considered a public nuisance, then the PCAPCD is required to investigate the identified source, as well as determine and ensure a solution for the source of the complaint, which could include operational modifications to correct the nuisance condition. Thus, although not anticipated, if odor or air quality complaints are made upon development of the Revised Project, the PCAPCD would be required (per PCAPCD Rule 205) to ensure that such complaints are addressed and mitigated, as necessary. Impacts would be less than significant and would not result in new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to odors from what could have resulted for the site under the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project.

Dust

As noted previously, construction of projects within Placer County are required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations. The aforementioned rules would act to reduce construction-related dust by implementing dust control measures. For example, PCAPCD Rule 228 requires implementation of dust control measures, such as minimizing track-out on to paved public roadways, limiting vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces to 15 miles per hour, and stabilization of storage piles and disturbed areas. Following construction, vehicles operating within the Revised Project site would be limited to paved areas of the site, which would not have the potential to create substantial dust emissions. Thus, Revised Project operations would not include sources of dust that could adversely affect a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant and would not result in

new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to dust from what could have resulted for the site under the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project.

3.3.2.5 Cumulative Emissions

A cumulative impact analysis considers a project over time in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects whose impacts might compound those of the project being assessed. Due to the dispersive nature and regional sourcing of air pollutants, air pollution is already largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants, including ozone and PM, is a result of past and present development, and, thus, cumulative impacts related to these pollutants could be considered cumulatively significant.

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

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS and, thus, result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM_{10} are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM_{10} emissions would be less than PCAPCD project-level thresholds, the project would not be expected to conflict with any relevant attainment plans, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. As a result, the PCACPD's established operational phase cumulative-level emissions thresholds are identical to the operational thresholds.

As shown in Table 2, operational emissions would be below the PCAPCD's project-level thresholds, and, thus, would be below the PCAPCD's cumulative-level thresholds as well. Accordingly, impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of criteria pollutants for which the PCAPCD region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State AAQS would be considered less than significant.

The 2002 EIR concluded that buildout of the entire annexation area would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to the PCAPCD's ability to bring the region into attainment. However, as noted above, the Revised Project's individual contribution towards this impact would be less than significant. In addition, the Revised Project does not change the conclusion of the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would not result in any changes, new circumstances, or new information that would involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to criteria pollutant emissions from what could have resulted for the site under the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project.

3.3.3 Air Quality Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures GMM-1(a), GMM-1(b), GMM-2(a), GMM-2(b) and GMM-2(d) through GMM-2(g) from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and would further reduce air quality impacts. Additionally, the air quality required measures in the 2002 EIR would be applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. Mitigation Measure GMM-2(c) from the 2002 EIR is specific to commercial developments and is therefore not applicable to the Revised Project, and is not provided below.

GMM-1(a) Prior to commencement of grading, the project applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/dust control plan for approval by the City engineer and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. This plan shall specify measures to reduce dust pollution during all phases of construction. These measures may include the following:

(i) Traffic speeds on all unpaved road surfaces shall be posted at 25 mph or less.

(ii) All grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 mph.

(iii) All trucks leaving the site shall be washed off to eliminate dust and debris.

(iv) All construction equipment shall be maintained in clean condition.

(v) All exposed surfaces shall be revegetated as quickly as feasible.

(vi) If fill dirt is brought to the construction site, tarps or soil stabilizers shall be placed on the dirt piles to minimize dust problems.

(vii) Water or dust palliatives shall be applied on all exposed earth surfaces as necessary to control dust. Construction contracts shall include dust control treatment as frequently as necessary to minimize dust.

(viii) No open burning of any kind.

GMM-1(b) The contractor shall reduce NO_X and ROG emissions by complying with the construction vehicle air pollutant control strategies developed by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. The contractor shall include in construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective:

(i) Contractors' construction equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned during construction activity.

(ii) Contractors shall use low emission mobile construction equipment where possible.

(iii) Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations.

(iv) The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road

equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. District personnel, with assistance from the California Air Resources Board, will conduct initial Visible Emission Evaluations of all heavy-duty equipment on the inventory list.

(v) Construction contracts shall stipulate that at least 20% of the heavy-duty off-road equipment included in the inventory be powered by CARB-certified off-road engines, as follows:

175 hp	750hp	1996 and newer engines
100 hp	174 hp	1997 and newer engines
50hp	99hp	1998 and newer engines

In lieu of or in addition to this requirement, an applicant can use other measures to reduce particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions from their project through the use of emulsified diesel fuel and/or particulate matter traps. The District shall be contacted to discuss this measure.

GMM-2(a) The City shall not approve building permits for fireplaces in homes that do not have a primary heating source other than a fireplace. All fireplaces shall be plumbed for natural gas (if available).

GMM-2(b) Tree plotting programs shall include planting at least one tree per lot, for shade.

GMM-2(d) The subdivider and/or developer shall make available educational material to new residents in the project area to educate them about air pollution problems and solutions. Issues identified include transportation control measures (TCM), open burning practices, and use of wood burning fireplaces and stoves.

GMM-2(e) To reduce emissions associated with landscape management the project applicant shall landscape with native drought-resistant species, where appropriate, to reduce water consumption, emissions from lawn equipment, and to provide passive solar benefits.

GMM-2(f) Low NO_X hot water heaters shall be installed per Air District Rule.

GMM-2(g) The project applicant shall install an electrical outlet at the front and back of the residences for the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with all of Placer County Air Pollution Control District's rules and regulations.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with all requirements in the Uniform Building Code.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with all requirements in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, and all federal EPA mandated requirements.

REQ-MM Only USEPA certified woodstoves shall be installed.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with all Environmental Protection Agency regulations to wood burning stoves.

Additionally, the Revised Project would be subject to the City of Rocklin's standard air quality conditions of approval listed below. Adherence to the conditions would ensure impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting from the Revised Project would be less than significant.

1. Prior to commencement of grading, the developer shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan for approval by the City Engineer and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. This plan must address how the project meets the minimum requirements of sections 300 and 400 of Rule 228-Fugitive Dust.

2. Any diesel-powered equipment used during project construction shall be Air Resources Board (ARB) certified.

3. The prime contractor shall submit to the Placer County Air Quality Control District a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the District prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.

4. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified by APCD to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.

5. Processes that discharge 2 pounds per day or more of air contaminants, as defined by California State Health and Safety Code Section 39013, to the atmosphere may require a permit. Developers / Contractors should contact the Placer County Air Pollution Control District prior to construction or use of equipment and obtain any necessary permits.

6. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.

7. Traffic speeds on all unpaved road surfaces shall be posted at 15 mph or less.

8. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators to minimize the use of temporary diesel power generators.

9. All construction equipment shall be maintained in clean condition.

10. The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets (or use another method to control dust

as approved by the City) if silt, dirt mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares.

11. If fill dirt is brought to or exported from the construction site, tarps or soil stabilizers shall be placed on the dirt piles to minimize dust problems.

12. All grading operations shall be suspended when fugitive dust emissions exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis.

13. Fugitive dust emissions shall not exceed 40% opacity and shall not go beyond the property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas, the developer shall ensure such agents are controlled so as not to exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations.

14. The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive and dust is impacting adjacent properties.

15. Water shall be applied to control fugitive dust, as needed, to prevent impacts offsite. Operational water trucks shall be onsite to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.

16. In order to minimize wind driven dust during construction, the prime contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by the City).

17. Open burning of any kind shall be prohibited. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site.

18. Chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, shall be applied to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours).

19. All exposed surfaces shall be revegetated as quickly as feasible.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.4.1 Summary of Biological Resources Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project may result in the loss of rare plant populations, which could result in potentially significant biological impacts. Such impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measures QMM-1(a) through QMM-1(c). The project would also result in the loss of native oak trees, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Construction of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to have the potential to result in the loss of wetlands; however, such impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance with Mitigation Measures QMM-3(a) and QMM-3(b). Similarly, the project was determined to result in potentially significant impacts to stream channels through alternation or degradation of such channels during construction and grading activities. Impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance with Mitigation Measure QMM-4.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to have the potential to result in the disturbance of nesting migratory birds or raptors. Impacts would be lowered to below a level of significance through Mitigation Measures QMM-6(a) through QMM-6(c). The project was also determined to have the potential to result in the loss of federally listed vernal pool crustaceans and their habitat. Impacts would be lowered to below a level of significance through Mitigation Measures QMM-7(a) and QMM-7(b). The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to the loss of individual elderberry longhorn beetles and their habitat, and would not conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with other development projects occurring in western Placer County, may contribute to regional loss of wetlands and habitat for plants and wildlife. Implementation of Mitigation Measures QMM-1 and QMM-3 through QMM-7 would lower such impacts, but cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

3.4.2 Biological Resources Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The site was previously rough-graded, and on-site vegetation consists of sparse grasses. There are no trees on the Revised Project site. The Revised Project involves increasing the residential density at the site. Such changes would not result in increased impacts to biological resources. The Revised Project would remain within the boundaries of the site and would not result in construction or operation in new areas that may result in disturbance of any sensitive species, sensitive natural community, riparian habitat, wetlands, or migratory species that wouldn't have already been impacted by implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Additionally, the Revised Project would not increase impacts identified in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures QMM-1(a) through QMM-1(c), and QMM-6(a) through QMM-6(c). The Revised Project would also implement the two biological resources required measures identified in the 2002 EIR, and listed under Section 3.4.3 of this Addendum, below. Mitigation Measures QMM-3(a), QMM-7(a), and QMM-7(b) would not be required because they are not applicable to projects within the Sunset Ranchos geographic planning area, such as the Revised Project. Mitigation measures QMM-3(b) and QMM-4 would not be required because the Revised Project is not filing a tentative map and there are no wetlands on the site. Therefore, the Revised Project would not increase impacts over what was identified in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

3.4.3 Biological Resources Mitigation Measures

Although the Revised Project site has been graded and contains minimal vegetation, it has the potential to result in significant impacts to rare plant populations, and nesting birds and raptors. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures QMM-1(a) through QMM-1(c), and QMM-6(a) through QMM-6(c). The Revised Project would also implement the two biological resources required measures

identified in the 2002 EIR, and listed below. Implementation of such measures would reduce all impacts to below a level of significance, with the exception of potential impacts to native oak trees. Consistent with the 2002 EIR, potential impacts to native oak trees, in addition to cumulative impacts to biological resources, would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures QMM-3(a), QMM-7(a), and QMM-7(b) from the 2002 EIR would not be required because they are not applicable to projects within the Sunset Ranchos geographic planning area, such as the Revised Project. Mitigation Measures QMM-3(b) and QMM-4 from the 2002 EIR would not be required because the project site does not include filing a tentative map and the project site does not contain any seasonal wetlands, jurisdictional waters of the Unites States, or the bed, channel or bank of any stream. Therefore, they are not listed below.

QMM-1(a) Prior to approval of tentative maps, design review, or use permits for all parcels other than the Sunset Ranchos portion, special-status plant surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period for species expected to occur in the area.

QMM-1(b) Disturbed special-status plant populations shall be transplanted to an approved mitigation site and/or mitigation credits shall be purchased in an approved mitigation bank to ensure no net loss of rare plant populations.

QMM-1(c) Transplanted populations will be monitored by a qualified biologist/botanist for a period of *5* years. If there is greater than 80 percent survival of transplanted individuals the mitigation will be considered a success. Additional plants will be required if the 80 percent survival goal is not met.

QMM-6(a) The project applicant, in consultation with the City of Rocklin and CDFG, shall conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 15 through August 30) of the project site during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified raptor biologist to determine if any birds-of-prey are nesting on or directly adjacent to the project site. No surveys would be needed if construction activities occur outside of the dates shown.

If phased construction procedures are planned for the project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. A new survey shall be conducted for construction occurring in subsequent seasons.

A report shall be submitted to the City of Rocklin, following the completion of the raptor nesting survey that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

A description of methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, and a list of references cited and persons contacted. A map showing the location(s) of any raptor nests observed on the project site.

If the above survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on the project site, no further mitigation shall be required. However, should any raptor species be found nesting on the project site, the following mitigation measure (QMM-6(b)) shall be implemented.

QMM-6(b) The project applicant, in consultation with the City of Rocklin and CDFG, shall avoid all birds-of-prey nest sites located in the project site during the breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. The occupied nest shall be monitored by a qualified raptor biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a nondisturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone will be determined in consultation with the City and CDFG. Highly visible temporary construction fencing shall delineate the buffer zone.

QMM-6(c) If a legally protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 30th or until the adults and young are no longer dependent on the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the City of Rocklin Tree Ordinance (Chapter 17.77 of the Rocklin Municipal Code (Ordinance 676)), including payment of fees and/or replacement of trees.

As trees do not occur on the Revised Project site, no further mitigation is required.

REQ-MM Measures to protect VELB are already outlined in the Biological Opinion for the Sunset Rancho's project dated July 21, 2000 and amended on October 13, 2000 (Service File 1-1-00-F-0044, Corps File 199800668) as part of General Condition 11 of the Nationwide Permit No. 26 wetlands fill permit for that project. These measures may include the following:

All contractors and construction crews shall be briefed on the status of VELB (federally listed as threatened) and need to protect its host plant, requirements to avoid damaging elderberry plants, and possible penalties for not complying with identified mitigation and monitoring measures. All elderberry stems of at least 1.0-inch diameter at ground level that cannot be avoided during construction activities shall be transplanted to a USFWS-approved mitigation area. All transplanting of elderberry plants shall occur during the plants' dormant season (November to mid-February) and follow the standards set forth in the USFWS *Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (July 9, 1999).*

As elderberry shrubs do not occur on the Revised Project site, no further mitigation is required.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.5.1 Summary of Cultural Resources Impacts from 2002 EIR

As discussed in the 2002 EIR, no known historic properties have been listed within the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project site. However, prehistoric resources that could be eligible for the NHRP have been identified within the project boundaries. Additionally, there is the potential for the inadvertent discovery of previously known historic resources, prehistoric resources, and human remains. Further, the construction of off-site infrastructure such as utilities would have the potential to damage or destroy undiscovered archaeological or historic resources. Therefore, impacts related to historic resources, prehistoric resources, and human remains would be potentially significant. Such impacts could be

reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measures NMM-1(a), NMM-1(b), NMM-2(a), NMM-2(b), and NMM-3. The 2002 EIR also found that the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with additional development in the City and County, could result in significant cumulative impacts to previously identified or unidentified cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NMM-4 would lessen such impacts, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

3.5.2 Cultural Resources Impacts Associated with Revised Project

Senate Bill (SB) 18 was signed into law in September 2004 and became effective in March 2005. SB 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) requires city and county governments to consult with California Native American tribes early in the planning process with the intent of protecting traditional tribal cultural places. The purpose of involving tribes at the early stage of planning efforts is to allow consideration of tribal cultural places in the context of broad local land use policy before project-level land use decisions are made by a local government. As such, SB 18 applies to the adoption or substantial amendment of general or specific plans. The process by which consultation must occur in these cases was published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research through its Tribal Consultation Guidelines: Supplement to General Plan Guidelines (Governor's Office of Planning and Research 2005). The Revised Project is not seeking any amendment of general or specific plans, and therefore, no tribal consultation under SB 18 is required.

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) established a formal consultation process for California Native American tribes as part of CEQA and equates significant impacts on tribal cultural resources with significant environmental impacts (Public Resources Code Section 21084.2). AB 52 consultation requirements went into effect on July 1, 2015 for all projects that had not already published a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration or published a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report prior to that date (Section 11 [c]). Specifically, AB 52 requires that "prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, the lead agency shall begin consultation" (21808.3.1 [a]), and that "the lead agency may certify an environmental impact report or adopt a mitigated negative declaration for a project with a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource only if" consultation is formally concluded (21082.3[d]). However, in the case of the current Revised Project, the lead agency has prepared this Addendum to a previously certified EIR, in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. An Addendum was determined to be the most appropriate document because none of the conditions described in Section 15162, calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR, have occurred. The Addendum addresses minor technical changes or additions and confirms that the Revised Project is consistent with what was previously analyzed under the certified EIR. As such, the Addendum will not result in an additional certification; therefore, the AB 52 procedures specified in PRC Sections 21080.3. 1(d) and 21080.3.2 do not apply and no tribal consultation under AB 52 is required.

The Revised Project involves increasing the residential density at the site. Such changes would not result in increased impacts to historic resources, prehistoric resources, or human remains. The Revised Project would remain within the boundaries of the site and would not result in additional ground-disturbing activities that could disturb previously identified or unidentified cultural resources. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures NMM-1(a), NMM-1(b), NMM-3, and NMM-4 from the 2002 EIR. Mitigation Measures NMM-2(a) and NMM-2(b) would not be required because they are specific to a known cultural resource that is not located within the Revised Project boundaries. Therefore, the

Revised Project would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation. However, consistent with the 2002 EIR, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

3.5.3 Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures NMM-1(a), NMM-1(b), and NMM-3 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and would reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to below a level of significance. Mitigation Measure NMM-4 from the 2002 EIR would remain applicable to the Revised Project to address potential cumulative cultural impacts; however, consistent with the 2002 EIR, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures NMM-2(a) and NMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR would not remain applicable to the Revised Project, and therefore are not included below.

NMM-1(a) If, during construction, the project applicant, any successor in interest, or any agents or contractors of the applicant or successor discovers a cultural resource (such as CA-PLA-616) that could qualify as either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, work shall immediately stop within 100 feet of the find, and both the City of Rocklin and a representative of the Indian Community shall be immediately notified. Work within the area surrounding the find (i.e., an area created at a 100-foot radius emanating from the location of the find) shall remain suspended while a qualified archaeologist, retained at the applicant's expense, conducts an onsite evaluation, develops an opinion as to whether the resource qualifies as either an historical resource or an unique archaeological resource, and makes recommendations regarding the possible implementation of avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation measures. Based on such recommendations, as well as any input obtained from the Indian Community within 72 hours (excluding weekends and State and federal holidays) of its receipt of notice regarding the find, the City shall determine what mitigation is appropriate. At a minimum, any Native American artifacts shall be respectfully treated and offered to the Indian Community for permanent storage or donation, at the Indian Community's discretion, and any Native American sites, such as grinding rocks, shall be respectfully treated and preserved intact. In considering whether to impose any more stringent mitigation measures, the City shall consider the potential cost to the applicant and any implications that additional mitigation may have for project design and feasibility. Where a discovered cultural resource is neither a Native American artifact, a Native American site, an historical resource, nor a unique archaeological resource, the City shall not require any additional mitigation, consistent with the policies set forth in Public Resources Code sections 21083.2 and 21084.1.

NMM-1(b) If, during construction, the project applicant, any successor in interest, or any agents or contractors of the project applicant or successor discovers any human remains, the following steps should be taken:

(1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

(A) The project applicant or its successor in interest contacts the Placer County Coroner so that Coroner can determine whether any investigation of the cause of death is required, and

(B) If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American:

1. The Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours (excluding weekends and State and federal holidays).

2. After hearing from the Coroner, the project applicant or its successor in interest shall immediately notify the City of Rocklin and a representative from the Indian Community of the Coroner's determination, and shall provide the Indian Community the opportunity, within 72 (excluding weekends and State and federal holidays) hours thereafter, to identify the most likely descendant.

3. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.

4. The most likely descendent, as identified by either the Native American Heritage Commission or the Indian Community, may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98, or

(2) Subject to the terms of paragraph (3) below, where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

(A) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours (excluding weekends and State and federal holidays) after being notified by the Commission.

(B) The Indian Community is unable to identify a most likely descendent, or the most likely descendant identified by the Indian Community failed to make a recommendation within 72 hours (excluding weekends and State and federal holidays) after the project applicant or its successor notified the Indian Community of the discovery of human remains; or

(C) The landowner or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant identified by the Commission, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

(3) In the event that the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American in origin, and the Native American Heritage Commission and the Indian Community agree that the remains are of a person associated with the historic United Auburn Indian Community, the project applicant or its successor, if permitted by state law, shall provide the remains and any associated grave goods to the Indian Community with the understanding that the Indian Community will provide for burial with appropriate dignity at an appropriate location that will not be subject to future disturbance.

NMM-3 In the event that cultural resources are uncovered during project construction (e.g., foundations, historic tools, refuse/trash piles, shell deposits, arrowheads, chip stone, objects that appear to be out of place are observed), implement Mitigation Measures NMM-1(a) through (b).

NMM-4 Implement Mitigation Measure NMM-1.

3.6 ENERGY

3.6.1 Summary of Energy Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not include a chapter designated to energy; however, impacts related to electricity and natural gas were included within the Public Utilities chapter. As discussed in Section 3.18.1 of this Addendum, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, alone and in combination with future development in the City, was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to increasing the demand for electrical and natural gas facilities and supply. Implementation of the 234-unit development proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in less than significant impacts related to energy.

3.6.2 Energy Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The additional 54 units proposed by the Revised Project would require minimal amounts of electricity and natural gas over what was analyzed for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Energy used for construction would primarily consist of fuels in the form of diesel and gasoline. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction and would include the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes. Heavy-duty construction equipment associated with construction activities, haul trucks involved in the removal of construction and demolition materials, and smaller support equipment (such as lighting, air compressors, and pumps) would consume petroleum-based fuel. Construction workers would travel to and from the project site throughout the duration of construction, presumably in gasoline-powered vehicles. Increasing the number of units at the site from 234 to 288 would not result in a significant increase in energy usage during construction.

Similarly, operation of the Revised Project would use energy primarily in the form of natural gas and electricity. Increasing the residential density at the site would not result in a significant increase in energy usage during operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Revised Project would result in less than significant direct and cumulative impacts to electricity and natural gas. Energy impacts would be less than significant, and would not be significantly greater than the energy impacts resulting from implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project.

3.6.3 Energy Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to energy would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

3.7 GEOLOGY/SOILS

3.7.1 Summary of Geology/Soils Impacts from 2002 EIR

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to be subject to less than significant levels of seismic ground shaking. The project included a required measure requiring the project to be consistent with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code, which would further reduce seismic ground shaking impacts. The 2002 EIR also determined that Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would cause a less than significant impact related to topographic alternation and soil disturbance that could lead to increased erosion potential. An additional required measure requiring compliance with the General Development Plan Grading Guidelines would further minimize these impacts. Additionally, the 2002 EIR determine that the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with buildout under the General Plan, would result in a less than significant impact related to exposing people and property to seismic hazards such as seismic ground shaking, hazards associated with geologic or soil conditions, and potential effects of erosion. Such impacts would be further minimized through compliance with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code.

The 2002 EIR identified that potentially significant geologic or soil-related impacts that could result from implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was limited to soil hazards. Site development would occur in areas underlain with Mehrten Formation, granitic materials, or in areas with shallow or expansive soils, which could present geotechnical hazards or require special construction methods. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures OMM-2(a) and OMM-2(b) identified in the 2002 EIR, impacts would be less than significant.

3.7.2 Geology/Soils Impacts Associated with Revised Project

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared for the Revised Project (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2019a). According to the Geotechnical Engineering Report, the Revised Project site is underlain by Mehrten Formation consisting of mudflow breccia and cobble conglomerate. Mudflow breccia generally consists of angular cobble and boulder-sized andesitic rocks in a cemented matrix or sand and silt. Cobble conglomerate generally consists of well-rounded cobbles and poorly sorted silty clay matrix. The near-surface soils at the site generally consist of silty, sandy, gravels and cobbles, with some areas being very rocky or having little or no soil. Permanent groundwater was not encountered at the site; however, it is relatively common to encounter perched water (and seeps) above the relatively impervious mudflow breccia, especially during winter and spring months.

The Geotechnical Engineering Report identified the potential for liquefaction at the Revised Project site as negligible due to the geologic, groundwater, soil, and rock conditions at the site. The report also identified the on-site surface and near-surface soils as suitable for use as engineered fill materials, provided they do not contain debris, significant clay concentrations, and organics. Additionally, the

surface soils (consisting primarily of silty, sandy, gravels and cobbles) are considered to be relatively non-expansive. On-site soil testing found that the soils are not considered corrosive to steel reinforcement properly embedded within Portland cement concrete. However, due to the soil characteristics at the site, blasting may be required during construction.

The Geotechnical Engineering Report did not identify significant geologic or soil-related hazards at the site. Additionally, the Revised Project would not increase geologic or soil-related impacts above those identified in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would result in an additional 54 units at the site, which would not cause significant ground shaking, topographic alternation, soil disturbance, or seismic hazards. The Revised Project would adhere to the recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Engineering Report, in addition to the geological required measures in the 2002 EIR requiring compliance with the California Building Code, Uniform Building Code, and General Development Plan Grading Guidelines. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Although the Geotechnical Engineering Report identified the soil at the Revised Project site as relatively non-expansive, the site was determined to be underlain by Mehrten Formation. The presence of Mehrten Formation caused the 2002 EIR to consider impacts related to shallow or expansive soils as potentially significant. Additionally, the Geotechnical Engineering Report found that blasting may be required due to the soil conditions at the site. Therefore, Mitigation Measures OMM-2(a) and OMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project. However, the requirements of Mitigation Measure OMM-2(a) (i.e., requiring a soil and/or geotechnical analysis) have already been fulfilled. Impacts related to geology and soils resulting from the Revised Project would be less than significant. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings of the 2002 EIR.

3.7.3 Geology/Soils Mitigation Measures

The Revised Project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geotechnical hazards requiring special construction methods due to the potential for expansive soils to occur and the potential for using blasting during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures OMM-2(a) and OMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The two geologic required measures from the 2002 EIR also remain applicable to the Revised Project and are also provided below.

OMM-2(a) Consistent with the City's Community Safety Element Policy 1, as well as State and local requirements, the City shall require soils and/or geotechnical analysis of new development proposals in areas with possible soil instability, earthquake faults or other geologic hazards. Preliminary reports must be submitted during review of tentative map, use permit, or design review applications. Final reports are required to be submitted concurrent with improvement plans. The geotechnical investigation shall be prepared by a professional engineer or geologist registered in the State of California in accordance with State regulations and to the satisfaction of the City. The City shall ensure recommendations pertaining to site preparation, construction, and building and roadway design are identified in the geotechnical report and are incorporated into each project design through the plan check and inspection process.

OMM-2(b) If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with site development, the contractor shall conduct the blasting activities in compliance with State and local regulations. The contractor shall obtain a blasting permit from the City of Rocklin prior to commencing

any blasting activities. Information submitted in order to obtain a blasting permit includes a description of the work to be accomplished and a statement of necessity for blasting as opposed to other methods considered, including avoidance of hard rock areas, safety measures to be implemented, such as blast blankets, and traffic ground shaking impacts. The contractor shall coordinate any blasting activities with police and fire departments to ensure proper site access control, traffic control, and public notification including the media, affected residents, and businesses, as appropriate. Blasting specifications and plans shall include a schedule that outlines the time frame that blasting will occur to limit noise and traffic inconveniences.

REQ-MM Development of the proposed project shall be consistent with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the proposed General Development Plan Grading Guidelines (See Appendix B of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan).

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

3.8.1 Summary of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not address GHG emissions for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. However, GHG emissions were broadly analyzed in Addendum No. 1 to the 2002 EIR. As discussed in Addendum No. 1, tools to evaluate the significance of a single project's contribution to global climate change resulting from GHG emissions did not exist at the time the report was prepared in 2008. No quantitative emission thresholds or similar criteria had been established and formally adopted to evaluate whether a single project's contribution to the cumulative global climate change impact would be considerable. Therefore, Addendum No. 1 included a qualitative analysis of GHG emissions resulting from the project.

Addendum No. 1 determined that long-term operation of the project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources, and indirectly from stationary sources associated with energy consumptions. GHG emissions generated by the project would primarily consist of carbon dioxide (CO_2), and mobile sources consisting of vehicle trips would be the primary source of GHG emissions. However, Addendum No. 1 determined that GHG emissions from the project would be small compared to globally generated emissions. Therefore, although quantitative thresholds were not available to use, the project's contribution as a percentage of state or global emissions was determined to be minor. Additionally, the project would implement the City of Rocklin's GHG emission reduction strategies to further reduce emissions. Therefore, Addendum No. 1 determined that implementation of the project would result in less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions.

3.8.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts Associated with Revised Project

GHG emissions contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on Earth. An individual project's GHG emissions are at a micro-scale level relative to global emissions and effects to global climate change; however, an individual project could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental

contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact. As such, impacts related to emissions of GHG are inherently considered cumulative impacts.

Implementation of the Revised Project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of CO_2 and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO_2 equivalents ($MTCO_2e/yr$).

In recognition of the global scale of climate change, California has enacted several pieces of legislations in an attempt to curb GHG emissions. Specifically, Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and, more recently, Senate Bill (SB) 32, have established statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. Accordingly, the CARB has prepared the Climate Change Scoping Plan for California (Scoping Plan), approved in 2008 and updated in 2014 and 2017, which provides the outline for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions and achieve the emissions reduction targets required by AB 32 and SB 32. In concert with statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, air districts, counties, and local jurisdictions throughout the State have implemented their own policies and plans to achieve emissions reductions in line with the Scoping Plan and emissions reduction targets, including AB 32 and SB 32.

GHG emissions were not specifically addressed in the 2002 EIR. However, potential impacts related to GHG emissions do not constitute "new information" as defined by CEQA, as GHG emissions were known as potential environmental issues before 1994. Therefore, the following discussion compares modeled operational GHG emissions that would occur under the approved buildout scenario under the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project to the modeled operational GHG emissions that would occur under the Revised Project. Modeling assumptions are provided in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, and the emission estimates are provided below.

3.8.2.1 Construction GHG Emissions

The total unmitigated construction related GHG emissions from the Revised Project were modeled to be 905.94 $MTCO_2e$, with an annual maximum of 707.85 $MTCO_2e/yr$. As such, the total construction related GHG emissions would be well below the PCAPCD's Bright Line Threshold of 10,000 $MTCO_2e/yr$, and Revised Project construction would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. As stated above, potential impacts related to GHG emissions do not constitute new information as defined by CEQA. Even though the 2002 EIR did not specifically evaluate GHG emissions, the Revised Project would not result in any changes, new circumstances, or new information that would involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to GHG emissions from what could have resulted for the site in the 2002 EIR.

3.8.2.2 Operational GHG Emissions

The estimated operational GHG emissions at full buildout of both scenarios in the first operational year (2024), are presented in Table 4, *Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions*.

Table 4
Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions ($MTCO_2e$/yr)

Emission Source	Approved Buildout	Revised Project	*Net Difference*
Area	55.73	68.60	*+12.87*
Energy	203.42	253.78	*+50.36*
Mobile	1,196.38	1,472.47	*+276.09*
Solid Waste	54.13	66.62	*+12.49*
Water	25.28	31.12	*+5.84*
TOTAL ANNUAL GHG EMISSIONS	**1,534.95**	**1,892.60**	***+357.65***
PCAPCD Screening Level Threshold	**1,100**		
PCAPCD Bright Line Threshold	**10,000**		

Note: Rounding may result in small differences in summation.
Source: Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021

As shown in the table, the Revised Project would result in operational GHG emissions in excess of the 1,100 $MTCO_2e$/yr operational threshold of significance. However, the net difference in GHG emissions of the Revised Project as compared to the approved buildout of the site from the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would be less than the 1,100 $MTCO_2e$/yr threshold, and the overall operational GHG emissions would be below the PCACPD's Bright Line Threshold of 10,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Because the net increase associated with implementation of the Revised Project would be below the applicable PCAPCD threshold, the Revised Project would not result in a significant increase in emissions beyond what could have occurred pursuant to the uses analyzed in the 2002 EIR for the site. Therefore, operations of the Revised Project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.

The Revised Project would not be considered to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Consequently, the Revised Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to impacts related to GHG emissions or climate change and the Revised Project's impact would be less than significant. Thus, the Revised Project would not result in any changes, new circumstances, or new information that would involve new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to GHG emissions from what could have resulted for the site under the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Additionally, the Revised Project would not result in more significant impacts than what was analyzed in Addendum No. 1. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.8.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to GHG emissions would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3.9.1 Summary of Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would not result in significant impacts related to the use, generation, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials within the site. The 2002 EIR also identified a required measure requiring compliance with Titles 8 and 22 of the Code of California Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Cody, as well as any other applicable regulation. Impacts related to the use, generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to have the potential to expose construction workers and the public to contaminated soil and/or groundwater. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures LMM-2(a) through LMM-2(d) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to increase the potential for wildland fires and create emergency ingress/egress problems, resulting in a potentially significant impact. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measures LMM-3(a) through LMM-3(c) to reduce impacts, in addition to five required measures related to potential fire hazards and emergency ingress/egress. Implementation of such measures would reduce impacts related to wildland fires and emergency ingress/egress to a less than significant level.

Development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Rocklin, was determined to have a less than significant impact related to increasing the number of people who could be exposed to potential hazards associated with potentially contaminated soils and groundwater and increasing transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials. However, implementation of the project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Rocklin, was determined to result in a potentially significant impact related to increasing the number of people exposed to hazards associated with wildland fires. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-5, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-3, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The 2002 EIR determined that all impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials could be mitigated to a less than significant level.

3.9.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The Revised Project involves increasing the residential density at the site from 234 units to 288 units. Increasing the residential density at the site would not result in a significant increase of impacts related to the use, generation, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials within the site. The Revised Project would adhere to the required measure from the 2002 EIR requiring compliance with Titles 8 and 22 of the Code of California Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, as well as any other applicable regulation. Impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the 2002 EIR.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was created for the Revised Project (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2019b). The Phase I ESA included an interview, a review of historical maps and photographs,

a review of records on soil and groundwater conditions at the site, a review of regulatory agency databases related to hazardous material incidents, a preliminary screen for vapor encroachment conditions (VEC), and an Environmental Lien Search. According to the Phase I ESA, the historical land use research revealed that the site was vacant land from at least 1891 to at least 1998. The site was mass graded in 2004 and has remained vacant land. A borrow pit was present on the southwestern portion of the site from at least 2006 to at least 2016. Soils from the southwestern portion of the site were excavated and used during the construction of University Avenue, located adjacent to the west of the site, which created the borrow pit. The borrow pit was backfilled in 2017 using soils from the site.

The regulatory agency database search completed by the Phase I ESA identified one Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Haznet listing within 0.25 mile of the site. The DTSC Haznet database is a list of all facilities that have submitted manifests for the disposal of hazardous waste at a landfill. However, a listing on the database is not considered to be indicative of a release of a hazardous material or petroleum product at a property. Additionally, one listing referred to as the Whitney Ranch Unit 2 property was identified at the site. The property is listed on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) database, which is a list of properties that have had construction activities and have implemented best management practices (BMP) to prevent sediment from being washed away from the site. A listing on the NPDES database does not indicate the release of a hazardous material or petroleum product. The Phase I ESA did not identify Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) at the site. One additional listing was identified at the Whitney Ranch High School, approximately 0.08 mile north of the site. The facility is listed on the California Environmental Reporting System and Placer County Master List. Both databases are lists of facilities that are permitted, inspected, and/or registered with Placer County. A listing on these databases is not indicative of a release of petroleum products or hazardous materials. The Phase I ESA notes that this listing has not impacted the Revised Project site. The preliminary VEC screening determined that a VEC does not or is not likely to exist within the site. Additionally, the Environmental Lien Search identified no environmental liens or activity or use limitations recorded for the site.

Based on the foregoing, the Phase I ESA identified no RECs at the site and stated that no further assessment is warranted at this time. Therefore, impacts related to existing hazardous environmental conditions at the site would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure LMM-2(a) from the 2002 EIR requires developments within the SR 65 Corridor to complete a Phase I ESA. The Revised Project does not occur within the SR 65 Corridor, so this measure is not applicable. However, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures LMM-2(b) through LMM-2(d) of the 2002 EIR.

The Revised Project would not increase wildland fire hazards at the site by increasing the number of residential units from 234 to 288. The Revised Project would also implement Mitigation Measures LMM-3(b) and LMM-3(c) from the 2002 EIR to reduce impacts, in addition to the four applicable required measures related to potential fire hazards and emergency ingress/egress. Implementation of such measures would reduce impacts related to wildland fires and emergency ingress/egress to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would be consistent with those evaluated in the 2002 EIR. Mitigation measure LMM-3(a) is specific to sites containing open space, and would not be applicable to the Revised Project. The Revised Project is also within 2 road miles of a fire station, so the required measure addressing projects farther than 2 road miles from a farther station is not applicable.

Implementation of the Revised Project would not result in a new significant cumulative impact related to increasing the number of people who could be exposed to potential hazards associated with potentially contaminated soils and groundwater and increasing transport, storage, and use of hazardous

materials. Impacts would remain less than significant. Additionally, the addition of 54 units would not result in a significant cumulative increase in exposing people to wildland fire hazards. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measure LMM-5 from the 2002 EIR, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-3, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

All impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials resulting from the Revised Project could be mitigated to below a level of significance using the 2002 EIR mitigation measures. Impacts would consistent with the findings of the 2002 EIR.

3.9.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures LMM-2(b) through LMM-2(d), LMM-3(b), LMM-3(c), and LMM-5 remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. The Revised Project would also adhere to the five applicable required measures listed in the 2002 EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials, which are also provided below. Mitigation Measure LMM-2(a) from the 2002 EIR is specific to developments occurring within the SR 65 Corridor and LMM-3(a) is specific to sites containing open space. Such measures are therefore not applicable to the Revised Project, and are not provided below. Additionally, the required measure addressing projects farther than 2 road miles from a farther station is not applicable and is not provided below.

LMM-2(b) If evidence of soil contamination, such as stained or odorous soils, or other evidence of hazardous materials is encountered during construction or development activities, work shall cease until an environmental professional, retained at the developer's expense, has evaluated the situation and identified necessary and appropriate follow-up actions. As part of this process, the City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities conducted in the project area are coordinated with Placer County Division of Environmental Health, and, if needed, other appropriate State agencies.

LMM-2(c) The City shall continue to update its records concerning contamination or hazards that may be present at facilities or sites adjacent to the project area, and take necessary action to ensure that the health and safety of the public is protected.

LMM-2(d) If, during construction of the proposed project, groundwater is encountered and dewatering activities are required, the water shall be analyzed by an environmental professional, retained at the applicant's expense, to determine if the water contains unsafe levels of pesticides, herbicides, nitrates, or other contaminants. Work shall not continue until results of the water analyses have been reported and the Placer County Division of Environmental Health has been informed of the results and has provided guidance.

LMM-3(b) The project should conform to all State Responsibility Area (SRA) requirements. After annexation and prior to development, the Proposed Project developer(s) shall enter into a contract/agreement with the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (CDF) to provide wildland fire suppression services. Terms, conditions, and limits of said contract shall be reviewed and accepted by the City of Rocklin Fire Department (RFD). It shall be at the discretion of the RFD Fire Chief when such contract/agreement should

terminate. Funding for this contract/agreement shall be the sole responsibility of the proposed project.

LMM-3(c) Implement Mitigation Measure KMM-5.

LMM-5 Implement Mitigation Measure LMM-3.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply, at a minimum, with the provisions of Titles 8 and 22 of the Code of California Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, as well as any other applicable regulation.

REQ-MM The timing for fire station construction shall be determined by the Rocklin City Council and shall be adequate to maintain desired service levels/response time to the project site. It is recommended that Fire Station #4 be constructed and staffed prior to full buildout.

REQ-MM Fire Flow requirements shall be met.

REQ-MM All roofs shall be fire resistive – Class-A type.

REQ-MM Development of the site shall be carried out in accordance with RFD rules and regulations and the Uniform Fire & Building Code Regulations adopted by the City of Rocklin.

3.10 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

3.10.1 Summary of Hydrology/Water Quality Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR found that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in exposure of persons or structures to hazards associated with a 100-year flood. However, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-1. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was also determined to have potentially significant impacts related to increasing the rate of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces, which could contribute to localized or downstream flooding. Impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through implementation of Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a) through PMM-2(c). Similarly, the project's potential to increase stormwater runoff was determined to cause potentially significant impacts related to increasing water surface elevations that would contribute to localized or downstream flooding. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-3 (which simply involves implementing Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a) through PMM-2(c)) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to have a less than significant impact related to degrading water quality through the increased generation of sediment. Still, the 2002 EIR provided a required measure requiring compliance with the State General Construction Activity Permit, which includes the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of BMPs/Best Available Technology (BAT) to control construction site runoff. Stormwater runoff from implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to potentially contain urban contaminants that could degrade water quality. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-5.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with other development in the City of Rocklin and the Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek watersheds, was determined to have the potential to increase impervious surfaces and urbanization that could cumulatively increase urban contaminant loading, adversely affecting water quality. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measure PMM-7, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-5. The 2002 EIR also included a required measure requiring the incorporation of techniques to minimize pollutants and sediments from entering the water. However, impacts would remain significant and unmitigable.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development that could occur within the City of Rocklin and the Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek Watersheds, could increase the rate of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-8, which simply requires implementation of mitigation measure PMM-2, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development that could occur within the City of Rocklin and the Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek Watersheds, could also increase the volume of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

3.10.2 Hydrology/Water Quality Impacts Associated with Revised Project

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center, the Revised Project is located within an area of minimal flood hazard and is not located within an area at an increased risk of hazards related to a 100-year flood (FEMA 2018). The Revised Project site is not at a significant risk of experiencing flood-related hazard, and the changes proposed by the Revised Project would not increase flood hazard risk at the site. Impacts would be less than those identified in the 2002 EIR, and Mitigation Measure PMM-1 is not required.

Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, the Revised Project would introduce new impervious surfaces to the site which may result in significant impacts related to increasing the rate of stormwater runoff, which could contribute to localized or downstream flooding. Impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through implementation of Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a) and PMM-2(b); Mitigation Measure PMM-2(c) is specific to projects within the SR 65 Corridor and is therefore not applicable to the Revised Project. Similarly, the Revised Project's potential to increase stormwater runoff may cause potentially significant impacts related to increasing water surface elevations that would contribute to localized or downstream flooding. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-3 (which simply involves implementing Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a) through PMM-2(c), although PMM-2(c) is not applicable to the Revised Project) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of the Revised Project would not result in impacts significantly higher than those evaluated in the 2002 EIR and would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Therefore, impacts would be the same those identified in the 2002 EIR.

Grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the Revised Project would have a less than significant impact related to degrading water quality through the increased generation of sediment because the proposed changes would not significantly increase the generation of sediment during construction. Still, the Revised Project would implement the required measure provided in the 2002 EIR requiring compliance with the State General Construction Activity Permit, which includes the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMP/BAT to control construction site runoff. The Revised Project would also implement Mitigation Measure PMM-5 to reduce impacts related to stormwater runoff that could potentially contain urban contaminants that could degrade water quality

to a less than significant level. Construction of the additional 54 units proposed by the Revised Project would not significantly increase impacts, and impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance through the mitigation in the 2002 EIR. Impacts would be the same as those identified in the 2002 EIR.

The Revised Project would result in similar cumulative hydrology impacts related to increasing impervious surfaces and urbanization that could cumulatively increase urban contaminant loading, adversely affecting water quality as those analyzed in the 2002 EIR. The addition of 54 units would not result in significantly greater cumulative impacts. Additionally, the Revised Project would incorporate Mitigation Measure PMM-7, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-5, in addition to the required measure requiring the incorporation of techniques to minimize pollutants and sediments from entering the water. Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, impacts would remain significant and unmitigable, and would not be significantly increased with the Revised Project.

The Revised Project would also result in similar cumulative hydrology impacts related to increasing the rate of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces as those analyzed in the 2002 EIR. The addition of 54 units would not result in significantly greater cumulative impacts. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measure PMM-8, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure PMM-2 (although, as discussed above, Mitigation Measure PMM-2(c) is not applicable to the Revised Project). Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Revised Project could also increase the volume of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces. However, impacts would be similar to significant and unavoidable impacts analyzed in the 2002 EIR.

Based on the foregoing, the potential for impacts to hydrology and water quality would not be substantially more severe under the Revised Project, and the conclusions reached in the prior report would remain the same. No associated mitigation would be required for the Revised Project.

3.10.3 Hydrology/Water Quality Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a), PMM-2(b), PMM-3, PMM-5, PMM-7, and PMM-8 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. Additionally, the two required measures related to hydrology and water quality from the 2002 EIR are applicable to the Revised Project and are also provided below. Mitigation Measures PMM-1 and PMM-2(c) are not applicable to the Revised Project and are therefore not provided below.

PMM-2(a) On-site detention shall be provided to meet Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (PCFCWCD) criteria set forth in Section VII of PCFCWCD's Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM). The SWMM requires, if on-site detention basins are to be used to mitigate downstream flooding effects due to project related increased peak flows, that the objective flow shall be taken as the estimated predevelopment peak flow rate less 10 percent of the difference between the estimated pre-development and post-development peak flow rates from the site. This standard shall be used for storm frequencies of 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year storm events. In no case shall the objective flow be less than the flows indicated in Figure 7-1 of the SWMM. However, in the event the results of stormwater runoff modeling indicate that on-site detention would exacerbate downstream flooding conditions when applying PCFCWCD numerical criteria, the City shall coordinate with the PCFCWCD to identify appropriate

use, location, and sizing of project detention facilities and implement a solution that will ensure conformance with PCFCWCD standards.

PMM-2(b) Installation and design of detention basins shall be in accordance with PCFCWCD's SWMM and in conformance with all applicable existing Master Plans, should such plans be adopted during project development. The results of hydro logic modeling shall be used to confirm that the capacity of the on-site detention facilities is adequate to detain the stormwater runoff anticipated following development of the proposed project. In concert with the proposed project's stormwater system design, the capacity of off-site culverts or existing and/or planned regional detention facilities shall be evaluated to determine whether oversizing is necessary to accommodate the project's incremental contribution.

PMM-3 Implement Mitigation Measures PMM-2(a) and PMM-2(b). Note: Mitigation Measure PMM-2(c) is not applicable to this Addendum.

PMM-5 Project Conditions of Approval shall specify that appropriate BMPs and Best Available Technologies (BAT) be incorporated into project design to reduce urban pollutants in runoff, consistent with goals and standards established under federal and State non-point source discharge regulations (NPDES permit) and Basin Plan water quality objectives. Stormwater runoff BMPs selected from the Storm Water Quality Task Force (*California Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook, 1993),* the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association *Start at the Source Design Guidance Manual,* or equally effective measures shall be identified prior to final design approval. To maximize effectiveness, the selected BMPs/BATs shall be based on finalized site-specific hydrologic conditions, with consideration for the types and locations of development. Mechanisms to maintain the BMPs/BATs shall be identified in the Conditions of Approval.

Typical BMPs and BATs that could be used at the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Application of appropriate signage to all storm drain inlets indicating that they outlet to the natural drainageways;
- Application of a street sweeping program to remove potential contaminants from street and roadway surfaces before they reach drainages;
- Installation of oil and grit separators in all drop inlets to capture potential contaminants which enter the storm drain system;
- Minimize sources of concentrated flow by maximizing use of natural drainages to decelerate flows, collect pollutants and suspended sediment;
- Establish vegetation in stormwater drainages to achieve optimal balance of conveyance and water quality protection characteristics;

- Placement of velocity dissipaters, rip-rap, and/or other appropriate measures to slow runoff, promote deposition of waterborne particles, and reduce the erosive potential of storm flows;

- Prompt application of soil protection and slope stabilization practices to all disturbed areas;

- Use sedimentation basins to collect and temporarily detain storm water runoff to provide ample settling time before runoff is discharged;

- Creation of storage basins consisting of depressed areas, usually lined, that are sized to hold storm runoff and settle out material (the facility usually has a type of outlet device that is above the bottom of the basin or a small rip rapped berm over which the treated water can flow);

- Creation of a below-ground storage basin consisting of vertical or horizontal corrugated metal or HDPE pipes sized to allow the volume of water required to be treated to percolate into the ground;

- Use of fossil filters consisting of small filters that are placed like troughs around the inside top drain inlets or at ditch outlets;

- Creation of underground storm water interceptors, which are underground tanks, similar to septic tanks, that are designed to allow material to settle out and also can have a grease trap to separate oil and petroleum products, prior to discharge; and,

- Use of rock-lined ditches, which are surface ditches that are lined with rock, with or without filter material, with the rock lining material designed to allow water to filter into the ground.

Provisions for the maintenance and periodic inspection of permanent facilities outside of the public right-of-way will be provided for in the CC&Rs. These provisions would include periodic inspection, cleaning, and the replacement of filter materials, as necessary to retain the integrity of the BMP/BAT.

PMM-7 Implement Mitigation Measure PMM-5.

PMM-8 Implement Mitigation Measure PMM-2.

REQ-MM Comply with the provisions of the State General Construction Activity Permit, which requires the preparation of a SWPPP and the implementation of BMPs/BATs to control construction site runoff.

Typical BMPs/BATs that could be used during construction of the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Temporary facilities such as waddles, sandbags, and hay bales may be used during construction. Temporary facilities are designed to help control dust and

will capture a majority of the siltation resulting from construction activities prior to discharging into existing natural channels. In addition, they will trap possible fuel and oil spills from construction equipment to prohibit contamination of surface flows or groundwater. The construction contractor would be required to monitor and maintain all BMPs/BATs during construction to ensure they function properly.

REQ-MM The project developer should comply with the following mitigation from the 1990 City of Rocklin General Plan Update EIR to prevent the degradation of water quality. The project developer should incorporate techniques such as, but not limited to, the prohibition of grading, placement of fill or trash, or alteration to vegetation within designated setback buffer areas, and the installation of feasible measures of minimizing pollutants and sediment from water originating from surfaced areas.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

3.11.1 Summary of Land Use and Planning Impacts from 2002 EIR

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was found to result in less than significant impacts related to converting agricultural and grazing land to non-agricultural use, resulting in less than significant impacts. The project was also found to result in less than significant impacts related to allowing development of land uses that could be incompatible with existing or planned surrounding land uses. The 2002 EIR found that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could allow development of land uses that could be internally incompatible. However, the 2002 EIR identified mitigation measure EMM-3, which requires implementation of Mitigation Measures FMM-5, HMM-4, HMM-5, and MMM-3. These mitigation measures would be implemented at the time of approval of the subsequent development entitlements (i.e., use permits, tentative maps, and/or design review). Implementation of Mitigation Measure EMM-3 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was found to result in less than significant impacts related to consistency with the City's General Plan or other City plans, policies, or ordinances. The project was also found to result in less than significant impacts related to consistency with Placer County LAFCO guidelines and policies. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to potentially restrict the amount of right-of-way available for a State highway interchange at North Whitney Boulevard (Parkway A), resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure EMM-6 from the 2002 EIR would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the 2002 EIR determined that the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in less than significant impacts to land use with mitigation.

3.11.2 Land Use and Planning Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The Revised Project involves increasing the density at the site through a density bonus. The Revised Project would increase the density of the site by 54 units from 20.0 to 24.6 units per acre. The Revised Project would increase the number of units from 234 to 288, resulting in an additional 54 residential units at the site over what was proposed in the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. The Revised Project does not propose changes to the City of Rocklin's General Plan. Additionally, the Revised Project does not propose different land uses at the site from what was analyzed in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would support the goals in the General Plan related to housing availability in the City. The

Revised Project would also contribute towards the City's goals of increasing affordable housing within the region.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project required implementation of Mitigation Measure EMM-3 to reduce land use impacts. EMM-3 required implementation of Mitigation Measures FMM-5, HMM-4, HMM-5, and MMM-3 to resolve impacts specific to transportation, noise, and aesthetics. Specifically, Mitigation Measure FMM-5 requires traffic studies when tentative maps are proposed for sites with a school overlay. As discussed in Section 3.17.2 of this Addendum, Mitigation Measure FMM-5 is not applicable to the Revised Project. Mitigation Measures HMM-4 and HMM-5 address potential noise impacts resulting from loading docks, schools, playgrounds, parks, and athletic fields and recreation areas associated with high school and community park sites. As discussed in Section 3.13.2 of this Addendum, Mitigation Measures HMM-4 HMM-5 are not applicable to the Revised Project and would not be required. Mitigation Measure MMM-3 addresses lighting issues associated with commercial properties, stadiums, and ball fields proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Such uses are not included in the Revised Project, and therefore Mitigation Measure MMM-3 is not applicable. As such, Mitigation Measure EMM-3 from the 2002 EIR would not be applicable to the Revised Project and would not be required to reduce potential land use impacts related to land use compatibility to a less than significant level. Additionally, the Revised Project would not restrict the amount of right-of-way available for a State highway interchange at North Whitney Boulevard; therefore, Mitigation Measure EMM-6 would not be applicable.

The Revised Project would result in less than significant impacts to land use and mitigation is not required. Impacts would be less than those identified in the 2002 EIR.

3.11.3 Land Use and Planning Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

3.12.1 Summary of Mineral Resources Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not contain a mineral resources chapter because the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project area was not known to contain mineral resources, so the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would not occur. Significant impacts to mineral resources would not occur with implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, and no mitigation was required.

3.12.2 Mineral Resources Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The Revised Project site is located within the boundaries of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project area, which is not known to contain mineral resources. The Revised Project would occur within Development Unit No. 8, which is currently undeveloped and is not used or zoned for mineral extraction. The site has not been associated with mineral mining, and therefore, no impacts to the loss of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource would occur. Significant impacts to mineral resources resulting from implementation of the Revised Project would not occur, and impacts are consistent with the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project evaluated in the 2002 EIR.

3.12.3 Mineral Resources Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to mineral resources would not occur, no mitigation is required.

3.13 NOISE

3.13.1 Summary of Noise Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR found that construction activities for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could temporarily increase noise levels at existing noise sensitive land uses (NSLUs), resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures HMM-1(a) and HMM-1(b), in addition to the required measure requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin construction Noise Compatibility Guidelines, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was found to result in residential development occurring within close proximity to existing and proposed roadways, resulting in a potentially significant impact related to exterior traffic noise levels to those residential areas. Impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through implementation of Mitigation Measures HMM-2(a) and HMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR. Project-generated traffic noise on the existing street system was anticipated to result in a less than significant impact, in both the project-specific and cumulative scenarios.

Operation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was found to result in potentially significant noise levels generated from the proposed land uses, including, but not limited to, commercial loading docks, school playgrounds, and neighborhood parks. Impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through implementation of Mitigation Measure HMM-4 from the 2002 EIR. Similarly, operation of the proposed open athletic fields and recreation areas, including the assemblage of large crowds and use of public address systems, could also result in significant operational noise impacts to adjacent residents. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measure HMM-5 to lower such impacts; however, noise impacts resulting from operation of the open athletic fields and recreation areas would remain significant and unavoidable.

3.13.2 Noise Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The Revised Project involves increasing the residential density at the site. Such changes would not result in an increase in construction noise impacts over those identified in the 2002 EIR because the Revised Project would still be confined within the same site boundaries. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures HMM-1(a) and HMM-1(b), in addition to the required measure requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin construction Noise Compatibility Guidelines, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, construction impacts would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, residential development proposed by the Revised Project may occur within close proximity to existing and proposed roadways. However, the changes proposed by the Revised Project would not worsen such impacts because the Revised Project would still be confined within the same site boundaries. Additionally, the addition of 54 residential units would result in a minimal increase in operational traffic (refer to Section 3.17 of this Addendum), and would not result in significant traffic noise levels. The Revised Project does not include a tentative map, so

Mitigation Measures HMM-2(a) and HMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR would not be required. Impacts would be lower than the findings in the 2002 EIR.

The 2002 EIR identified potential operational noise impacts resulting from commercial loading docks, schools, playgrounds, and parks. The Revised Project includes an approximately 4,186 sf clubhouse/amenity building, which would not contain open recreation areas. Noise impacts from the clubhouse/amenity building would be less than significant. The Revised Project includes outdoor amenities featuring a swimming pool, tot lot with play equipment, and outdoor patio with seating and barbeque picnic areas adjacent to the clubhouse and pool area. A small courtyard with seating, small patio, and a barbeque area is planned north of the clubhouse between two apartment buildings, and a small, fenced dog park with synthetic turf is planned near the south property line. Therefore, the Revised Project would result in operational noise associated with the outdoor swimming pool, tot lot with play equipment, and dog park. However, due to the nature of the proposed recreational amenities, noise levels are anticipated to be confined to the Revised Project site and are not anticipated to create significant off-site noise impacts. Mitigation Measure HMM-4 identified in the 2002 EIR is specific to the large-scale recreational sites proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, which are not included in the Revised Project. Additionally, the Revised Project does not include open athletic fields or recreation areas associated with the high school and community park sites proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Therefore, Mitigation Measures HMM-4 and HMM-5 would not be required. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

3.13.3 Noise Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures HMM-1(a) and HMM-1(b) from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and would reduce potentially significant noise impacts to below a level of significance. The noise required measure identified in the 2002 EIR would also be implemented to further lower noise impacts; as such, it is provided below as well. The Revised Project does not include a tentative map, so Mitigation Measures HMM-2(a) and HMM-2(b) from the 2002 EIR would not be required and are not provided below. Mitigation Measures HMM-4 and HMM-5 from the 2002 EIR are only applicable to the large-scale recreational sites proposed by the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, which are not included in the Revised Project. Therefore, they are not provided below.

HMM-1(a) All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall have manufacturer installed mufflers.

HMM-1(b) Equipment warm up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located in an area as far away from existing residences as is feasible.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the City of Rocklin construction Noise Compatibility Guidelines, including restricting construction-related noise generation activities within or near residential areas shall be restricted to between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays, and between 8:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekends.

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

3.14.1 Summary of Population and Housing Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would not result in significant impacts related to population and housing. Although the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was anticipated to include construction of 4,290 dwelling units, the 2002 EIR determined that the growth associated with such construction was consistent with the City of Rocklin's General Plan. Additionally, the project was determined to assist with the City of Rocklin's goal of providing adequate housing supply, including affordable housing units. Further, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project included commercial, light industrial, and business professional uses so the ratio of jobs and housing in the City of Rocklin would not experience significant adverse impacts. Impacts related to population and housing resulting from implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to be below a level of significance, and mitigation was not required.

3.14.2 Population and Housing Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The changes associated with the Revised Project would include increasing the residential density within Development Unit No. 8 and the provision of affordable housing units for low, very low, and extremely low-income households (with the exception of the 3 units reserved as manager units). Increasing the residential density within the site by 54 units would not cause the Revised Project to be inconsistent with the City of Rocklin's General Plan because it would further contribute to the City's goal of providing an adequate housing supply. Additionally, with the exception of three manager units, the project would provide affordable housing to low, very low, and extremely low-income households; therefore, the increase in residential density would allow for increased availability of affordable housing units. The addition of 54 units would not result in significant adverse impacts related to population and housing, and would not result in increased impacts over those identified in the 2002 EIR. Impacts would be consistent with those identified in the 2002 EIR, and mitigation is not required.

3.14.3 Population and Housing Mitigation Measures

As described in the 2002 EIR, impacts to population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

3.15.1 Summary of Public Services Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in a less than significant impact related to increasing the demand for law enforcement services and facilities in the City of Rocklin. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation was also determined to result in a less than significant impact related to creating a demand for additional law enforcement services and facilities when combined with future development in the City. Still, the 2002 EIR identified a required measure requiring the applicant to comply with the provisions of the City of Rocklin Construction Tax, which would further reduce impacts. Impacts to law enforcement services would be less than significant.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to significantly increase demand for fire protection/suppression services and emergency services, resulting in a significant impact. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measures KMM-3(a) and KMM-3(b), in addition to two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code, reducing impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in the placement of residences farther than the two road mile service area of the closest fire station. Impacts would be lowered to a less than significant level with Mitigation Measure KMM-4. The project could also result in residential development occurring upon terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities, and would require Mitigation Measure KMM-5 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department's emergency Radio Communication System, and would require Mitigation Measure KMM-6 to lower impacts to below a level of significance. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combinations with future development in the City, was also found to create a significant demand for additional fire protection and emergency services, resulting in a significant impact. However, the 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measure KMM-7 (which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure KMM-3(b)), in addition to two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts to fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant with mitigation.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to significantly increase the demand for school services in the Rocklin Unified School District (RUSD); however, the 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measure KMM-8, in addition to a required measure requiring the applicant to pay the applicable RUSD fees. Implementation of such measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the RUSD, was determined to result in a less than significant impact related to increasing the demand for school services. Therefore, impacts to schools would be less than significant.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, both alone and in combination with other development in the City of Rocklin, was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to increasing the demand for park facilities. Still, the 2002 EIR identified two required measures requiring compliance with the provision of the Park Development Fees in the Rocklin Municipal Code and compliance with the Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee, which would further reduce impacts. Therefore, impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

3.15.2 Public Services Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The changes proposed by the Revised Project include increasing the residential density at the site from 234 units to 288 units. The addition of 54 residential units would not result in significantly greater impacts to public services. Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, the Revised Project would result in a less than significant impact to law enforcement services.

The Revised Project may result in significant impacts related to increasing the demand on fire protection/suppression services and emergency services, in addition to resulting in the placement of residences within terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities. The Revised Project also may result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department emergency Radio Communications System and contribute to cumulative fire protection demands. However, increasing the development from 234 units to 288 units would not significantly increase impacts over

those analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures KMM-3(b), KMM-5, KMM-6, and KMM-7, which would reduce fire protection impacts to a less than significant level. The Revised Project would also adhere to the two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code. The Revised Project would not place residences farther than two road miles from the closest fire station and does not include open space; therefore, mitigation measure KMM-3(a) and KMM-4 are not required. Impacts would be consistent with those identified in the 2002 EIR.

The Revised Project would not result in a significantly greater demand for school services over what was analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, the Revised Project would pay the applicable Rocklin Unified School District fees under Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code 65995, unless the applicant and the District reach an agreement to mitigate the impacts on the school facilities caused by the proposed development and jointly request in writing that the condition be waived, per the required measure related to school impacts in the 2002 EIR. School impacts resulting from the Revised Project would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure KMM-8 would not be applicable to the Revised Project because it does not include revisions to the General Development Plan.

The Revised Project would result in a less than significant impact related to increasing the demand for park facilities. The addition of 54 residential units would not create a new significant impact to park facilities. Additionally, the Revised Project includes the construction of amenities for future residents, which would lessen the need for park facilities resulting from the Revised Project. The proposed community amenities include a 4,186 sf single-story clubhouse/amenity building near the center of the site with a clubroom with lounge areas, large-screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, laundry facilities, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities would include a swimming pool, tot lot with play equipment, and outdoor patio with seating and barbeque picnic areas adjacent to the clubhouse and pool area. A small courtyard with seating, small patio, and a barbeque area is proposed north of the clubhouse between two apartment buildings, and a small, fenced dog park with synthetic turf is planned near the south property line. The Revised Project would also implement the applicable required measure related to parks, which include compliance with the applicable Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee. The required measure requiring compliance with Chapter 16.28 and 17.71 of the Rocklin Municipal Code at the time of approval of the tentative subdivision maps is not applicable because the Revised Project does not include a tentative subdivision map. Therefore, implementation of the Revised Project would not result in a new need for park facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Revised Project would result in similar demands to law enforcement services, fire protection and emergency personnel services, schools, and parks. Additionally, the Revised Project would adhere to the applicable required measures related to public services included in the 2002 EIR. With the applicable mitigation measures and required measures from the 2002 EIR, impacts to public services would be less than significant.

3.15.3 Public Services Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures KMM-3(b), KMM-5, KMM-6, and KMM-7 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. Additionally, the applicable required measures related to public services would be implemented by the Revised Project and are provided below. The Revised Project would not place residences farther than two road miles from the closest fire station and does not include open space; therefore, mitigation measure KMM-3(a) and KMM-4 are not applicable and are

not provided below. Additionally, Mitigation Measure KMM-8 from the 2002 EIR is specific to the General Development Plan and is not applicable to the Revised Project. Therefore, Mitigation Measure KMM-8 is also not provided below.

KMM-3(b) The City and project applicant shall analyze the cost of fire protection and emergency medical response associated with the project and develop a funding mechanism to offset any shortfall.

KMM-5 Where residential dwellings are developed, all portions of the exterior first floor shall be within 150 feet of the public right-of-way. Structures not capable of meeting this requirement shall be considered a special hazard and fire sprinkler systems shall be installed. This mitigation measure shall be implemented at the time of approval of the Building Permits.

KMM-6 The project applicant shall install Radio Repeater towers as needed within the project site. Specific sites will be determined by the Fire Department, in conjunction with design review approvals.

KMM-7 Implement Mitigation Measure KMM-3(b).

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the City of Rocklin Construction Tax (Section 3.16 of the Rocklin Municipal Code), for the acquisition and development of parks, open space, bike trails, public buildings, and fire equipment needed as a result of increased development within the City. This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of Building permit issuance.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the Uniform Fire Code (adopted as Chapter 15.04 of the Rocklin Municipal Code). This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of Building permit issuance.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall pay Rocklin Unified School District fees under Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code 65995, to the satisfaction of the Rocklin Unified School District at the time of Building Permit issuance.

The above requirement shall be waived by the City Council if the applicant and the District reach an agreement to mitigate the impacts on the school facilities caused by the proposed development and jointly request in writing that the condition be waived.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee (Resolution No. 99-82). This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of approval of building permit application.

3.16 RECREATION

3.16.1 Summary of Recreation Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not include a chapter designated to recreation; however, impacts related to park facilities were analyzed within the Public Services chapter. As discussed in Section 3.15.1 of this Addendum, above, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, both alone and in combination with other

development in the City of Rocklin, was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to increasing the demand for park facilities. Still, the 2002 EIR identified two required measures requiring compliance with the provision of the Park Development Fees in the Rocklin Municipal Code and compliance with the Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee, which would further reduce impacts. Therefore, impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

3.16.2 Recreation Impacts Associated with Revised Project

As discussed in Section 3.15.2 of this Addendum, above, the Revised Project would result in a less than significant impact related to increasing the demand for park facilities. The addition of 54 residential units would not create a new significant impact to park or recreational facilities. Additionally, the Revised Project includes the construction of amenities for future residents, which would lessen the need for park facilities resulting from the Revised Project. The proposed community amenities include a 4,186 sf single-story clubhouse/amenity building near the center of the site with a clubroom with lounge areas, large-screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, laundry facilities, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities would include a swimming pool, tot lot with play equipment, and outdoor patio with seating and barbeque picnic areas adjacent to the clubhouse and pool area. A small courtyard with seating, small patio, and a barbeque area is proposed north of the clubhouse between two apartment buildings, and a small, fenced dog park with synthetic turf is planned near the south property line. The construction of such amenities would ensure accelerated degradation of existing park and recreational facilities would be minimal. Additionally, the proposed amenities are included as part of the Revised Project, so potential environmental impacts associated with construction of such facilities are evaluated within the entirety of this Addendum. The Revised Project would also implement the applicable required measure related to parks, which include compliance with the applicable Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee. The required measure requiring compliance with Chapter 16.28 and 17.71 of the Rocklin Municipal Code at the time of approval of the tentative subdivision maps is not applicable because the Revised Project does not include a tentative subdivision map. Therefore, implementation of the Revised Project would result in less than significant impacts related to recreation.

3.16.3 Recreation Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to recreation would be less than significant, no mitigation is required. However, the Revised Project would adhere to the applicable required measure related to parks, which is provided below.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the Community Park and Recreational Facilities Improvement Fee (Resolution No. 99-82). This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of approval of building permit application.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

3.17.1 Summary of Transportation Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project may result in a significant increase in traffic at intersections in the vicinity of the project. The 2002 identified Mitigation Measures FMM-1(a) and FMM-1(b), in addition to a required measure requiring the developer to pay applicable traffic impact fees to the City of Rocklin Capital Improvement Project, which would reduce

impacts to a less than significant level. The 2002 EIR also determined that development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project may result in a significant increase in traffic at roadway segments in the vicinity of the project. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measures FMM-2(a) and FMM-2(b), which would reduce impacts; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The project's impact related to creating a demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in a potentially significant impact on creating a demand for transit services; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure FMM-4 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The 2002 EIR determined that the omission of school sites from the annexation area could result in significant impacts related to creating traffic congestion in portions of the site. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure FMM-5. Development of the school sites was also determined to result in a significant impact related to on-street parking and parking in residential neighborhoods. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure FMM-6.

Development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to increase traffic on City of Rocklin roadways and at roadway intersections in the vicinity of the project under cumulative conditions, resulting in a significant impact. The 2002 EIR identifies Mitigation Measures FMM-7(a) through FMM-7(e) to reduce impacts, in addition to the required measure discussed above; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Under cumulative conditions, development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would create a significant demand for transit services as phased development occurs, resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure FMM-8, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure FMM-4, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to increase traffic on City of Roseville intersections and roadways and State highways in the vicinity of the project under cumulative conditions, resulting in a significant impact. The 2002 EIR identifies Mitigation Measures FMM-9(a) through FMM-9(c), in addition to the required measure discussed above, to reduce impacts. However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

3.17.2 Transportation Impacts Associated with Revised Project

An Access Evaluation was prepared to analyze potential transportation impacts resulting from the Revised Project (Kimley Horn 2021). The Access Evaluation that implementation of the 288-unit Revised Project would result in a trip generation of 30 trips in and 100 trips out during the AM peak hour, and 95 trips in and 56 trips out during the PM peak hour. As detailed in the attached site plan, the Revised Project would be served by a single, consolidated access driveway along University Avenue. This access location is intended facilitate all routine site ingress and egress. University Avenue currently has two lanes with previously constructed median islands that will eventually form the left-turn lanes (southbound in the Revised Project site and northbound into the future development area west of University Avenue. As a result, the interim access to the Revised Project site is anticipated to be accomplished via the existing two-lane roadways without a southbound left-turn pocket, with side street stop control (SSSC). Ultimately, the full construction of University Avenue will provide two lanes in each direction and left-turn lanes, also initially anticipated to be SSSC.

An Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) driveway is proposed along Wildcat Boulevard. This access location is in the southeast corner of the Revised Project site and would use an existing driveway cut along Wildcat Boulevard, just south of the existing traffic signal that serves Whitney High School (southern

access location). In the event of an emergency, this driveway is anticipated to be used by emergency personnel to both access the site and, as needed, facilitate egress maneuvers to supplement the primary driveway on University Avenue.

The Access Evaluation analyzed the following scenarios and their associated geometric and access conditions:

- Existing Conditions
    1. University Avenue (2-lane) at the site access driveway: full access, SSSC
    2. University Avenue at Whitney Ranch Parkway: all-way stop control (AWSC)
- Near-Term Conditions
    1. University Avenue (4-lane) at the site access driveway: full access, SSSC
    2. University Avenue at Whitney Ranch Parkway: roundabout

The Access Evaluation also approximated the peak-hour turning movements associated with the Revised Project at the study facilities noted above to allow for an evaluation and recommendation of treatments. Based on the analysis, the Access Evaluation provided recommendations for the conditions anticipated to result from implementation of the Revised Project. The recommendations are related to the University Avenue access intersection, University Avenue intersection at Whitney Ranch Parkway, and Wildcat Boulevard Access. Each are discussed below.

The University Avenue access intersection would operate acceptably under the existing condition (with SSSC) with the addition of the Revised Project. Under the Near-Term conditions when the adjacent development is assumed to be fully developed, both SSSC and AWSC are shown to be ineffective to accommodate the mix of traffic. A traffic signal was evaluated as a possible solution but was found to result in operational issues and is not anticipated to be desired by the City as it was not originally planned and the observed conflicting volumes (heavy northbound left-turn, eastbound right-turn, and westbound left-turns) could be better served using an alternate traffic control treatment. Accordingly, the Access Evaluation also analyzed the effectiveness of a compact roundabout intersection. The application of a roundabout at this location, anticipated to generally fit within the same intersection footprint as the traffic signal, would result in lower intersection delays and provide an overall better intersection Level of Service (LOS). Therefore, a roundabout is recommended by the Access Evaluation at this location.

The intersection of University Avenue and Whitney Ranch Park would operate acceptably under both existing (AWSC) and Near-Term (roundabout) conditions. The Revised Project would not change the conclusions or recommendations of the prior evaluation.

As previously discussed, the Revised Project proposes an EVA in the southeast corner of the Revised Project site, just south of the existing traffic signal that serves Whitney High School (southern access location). The Access Evaluation strongly discourages creating a permanent egress-only driveway at this location. This driveway location is just south of the existing traffic signal and a significant safety concern would be created by allowing egressing vehicles from the Revised Project site to access Wildcat Boulevard. The driveway location would be hampered by sight distance obstructions for vehicles looking

left (to the north), challenged by confusion regarding the signal phasing and which conflicting vehicles have the right-of-way, and further complicated by vehicles being tempted to illegally cut across the intersection to access the high school or to travel north along Wildcat Boulevard into Lincoln. Lastly, if this driveway were to be realigned and become the fourth leg to the existing signalized intersection, while safer for egressing vehicles, this connection would create the potential for cut-through traffic by providing a link between University Avenue and Wildcat Boulevard that may be perceived as a shortcut for local traffic. Therefore, the Access Evaluation recommends to only allow an EVA at Wildcat Boulevard and, therefore, concentrate all Revised Project access to University Avenue.

The Revised Project would incorporate all recommendations from the Access Evaluation into the final design, resulting in less than significant impacts related to nearby intersections and site access. Impacts would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. Additionally, Mitigation Measures FMM-1(a), FMM-1(b), FMM-2(a), FMM-2(b), FMM-7(a) through FMM-7(e), and FMM-9(a) through FMM-9(c) are not applicable to the Revised Project site because they are specific to roadway segments and intersections that are not within the vicinity of the Revised Project. Mitigation Measure FMM-5 is not applicable to the Revised Project because it is specific to tentative maps proposed for sites designated with a school overlay, which is not included in the Revised Project. Mitigation Measure FMM-6 is also not applicable to the Revised Project because it addresses school parking plans, which are not included in the Revised Project. Therefore, such measures from the 2002 EIR would not be required.

Implementation of the Revised Project would result in an additional 54 units at the site, which may result in a slight increase in demand for public transit services. However, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures FMM-4 and FMM-8 from the 2002 EIR, which would reduce potential direct and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Therefore, potential transportation impacts resulting from implementation of the Revised Project would be less than those identified in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement the required measure in the 2002 EIR, further reducing impacts. The Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

3.17.3 Transportation Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures FMM-4 and FMM-8 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement the transportation required measure identified in the 2002 EIR, which is also provided below. Mitigation Measures FMM-1(a), FMM-1(b), FMM-2(a), FMM-2(b), FMM-5, FMM-6, FMM-7(a) through FMM-7(e), and FMM-9(a) through FMM-9(c) are not applicable to the Revised Project, and are not provided below.

FMM-4 The City shall ensure that, as future entitlements are planned in the annexation area, the City shall coordinate with Placer County Transit (PCT) to ensure that transit services are in place as needed to serve demand from new development.

FMM-8 Implement Mitigation Measure FMM-4.

REQ-MM The project developer shall pay traffic impact fees for the City of Rocklin Capital Improvement Program, as established by City Council Resolution.

3.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

3.18.1 Summary of Utilities and Service Systems Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in an increased demand for water supply, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure JMM-1 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could also require additional water conveyance infrastructure, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with Mitigation Measure JMM-2. The 2002 EIR determined that impacts related to increasing the demand for water treatment would be less than significant. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the City and Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) service area, would increase the demand for water supply, resulting in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the City and other PCWA Zone 1 service areas, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to increasing the demand for water conveyance facilities and water treatment.

Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in a potentially significant impact related to increasing the demand for wastewater conveyance. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with Mitigation Measure JMM-7. Impacts related to increasing the demand for wastewater treatment would be less than significant. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the City and South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) service area, would result in significant cumulative impacts related to the increase in demand for wastewater conveyance. Implementation of Mitigation Measure JMM-9, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure JMM-7, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Cumulative impacts resulting from the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the City and SPMUD service area, related to increasing the demand for wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

The 2002 EIR determined that implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project would result in less than significant impacts related to the generation of construction and operational solid waste. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future development in the City, would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to increasing the demand for solid waste collection and disposal.

The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, alone and in combination with future development in the City, was determined to result in less than significant impacts related to increasing the demand for electrical and natural gas facilities and supply.

3.18.2 Utilities and Service Systems Impacts Associated with Revised Project

The Revised Project includes the addition of 54 residential units, increasing the proposed development from 234 units to 288 units. The addition of 54 units would not result in a significant increase of impacts related to an increased demand for water supply or requiring additional water conveyance infrastructure over what was analyzed in the 2002 EIR. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures JMM-1 and JMM-2 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, impacts related to water treatment would be less than significant. The Revised Project may result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to increasing the

demand of water supply; however, impacts would not be significantly greater than those analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, the Revised Project would result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to increasing the demand for water conveyance facilities and water treatment. Impacts to water utilities resulting from implementation of the Revised Project would be consistent with the findings in the 2002 EIR.

The changes proposed by the Revised Project would not result in a significantly greater impact on wastewater utilities. Similar to the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measure JMM-7 to reduce impacts to wastewater conveyance to a less than significant level. Impacts related to increasing the demand for wastewater treatment would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts related to wastewater conveyance would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure JMM-9, and cumulative impacts related to increasing the demand for wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Implementation of the Revised Project involves the construction of an additional 54 units at the site, which would generate minimal additional waste over what was analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Therefore, impacts related to the generation of solid waste during construction and operation would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts related to increasing the demand for solid waste collection and disposal would be less than significant as well.

The additional 54 units proposed by the Revised Project would require minimal amounts of electricity and natural gas over what was analyzed for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project. Therefore, the Revised Project would result in less than significant direct and cumulative impacts to electricity and natural gas.

Impacts to utilities and service systems resulting from implementation of the Revised Project would be consistent with those analyzed in the 2002 EIR.

3.18.3 Utilities and Service Systems Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures JMM-1, JMM-2, JMM-7, and JMM-9 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below.

JMM-1 The project proponent shall participate in regional water use efficiency measures proposed by PCWA.

JMM-2 The project applicant shall adhere to standard PCWA requirements and enter into a Pipeline Extension Agreement with PCWA and provide all pipelines and facilities necessary to supply adequate amounts of water for domestic and fire protection purposes. All system improvements shall be subject to PCWA approval.

JMM-7 The project applicant shall be obligated through project approval conditions at the time of tentative subdivision map, utility plans and design review approval, to fund and install infrastructure required to provide for the wastewater conveyance needs for each portion of the proposed project. Prior to construction of improvements outside the project boundaries, the developer shall submit to the City of Rocklin a construction plan that outlines the construction limits, construction schedule, traffic detours, noise and dust suppression, resident notification, and emergency service notification as requested by the City.

JMM-9 Implement Mitigation Measure JMM-7.

3.19 WILDFIRE

3.19.1 Summary of Wildfire Impacts from 2002 EIR

The 2002 EIR did not include a chapter designated to wildfire; however, impacts related to wildland fire risk were included within the Public Safety and Hazards chapter, and impacts related to fire suppression services were included within the Public Services chapter. As discussed in Section 3.9.1 of this Addendum, above, implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to increase the potential for wildland fires and create emergency ingress/egress problems, resulting in a potentially significant impact. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measures LMM-3(a) through LMM-3(c) to reduce impacts, in addition to five required measures related to potential fire hazards and emergency ingress/egress. Implementation of such measures would reduce impacts related to wildland fires and emergency ingress/egress to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Rocklin, was determined to result in a potentially significant impact related to increasing the number of people exposed to hazards associated with wildland fires. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-5, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-3, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

As discussed in Section 3.15.1 of this Addendum, above, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project was determined to significantly increase demand for fire protection/suppression services and emergency services, resulting in a significant impact. The 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measures KMM-3(a) and KMM-3(b), in addition to two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code, reducing impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in the placement of residences farther than the two-road mile service area of the closest fire station. Impacts would be lowered to a less than significant level with Mitigation Measure KMM-4. The project could also result in residential development occurring upon terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities, and would require Mitigation Measure KMM-5 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project could result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department's emergency Radio Communication System, and would require Mitigation Measure KMM-6 to lower impacts to below a level of significance. The Northwest Rocklin Annexation Project, in combinations with future development in the City, was also found to create a significant demand for additional fire protection and emergency services, resulting in a significant impact. However, the 2002 EIR identified Mitigation Measure KMM-7 (which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure KMM-3(b)), in addition to two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts to fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant with mitigation.

3.19.2 Wildfire Impacts Associated with Revised Project

As discussed in Section 3.9.2 of this Addendum, above, the Revised Project would not increase wildland fire hazards at the site by increasing the number of residential units from 234 to 288. The Revised Project would also implement Mitigation Measures LMM 3(b) and LMM-3(c) from the 2002 EIR to

reduce impacts, in addition to applicable required measures related to potential fire hazards and emergency ingress/egress. Implementation of such measures would reduce impacts related to wildland fires and emergency ingress/egress to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LMM-3(a) is specific to projects containing open space, and is therefore not applicable to the Revised Project. As such, impacts would be consistent with those evaluated in the 2002 EIR.

The addition of 54 units would not result in a significant cumulative increase in exposing people to wildland fire hazards. The Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measure LMM-5 from the 2002 EIR, which simply requires implementation of Mitigation Measure LMM-3, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

As discussed in Section 3.15.2 of this Addendum, above, the Revised Project may result in significant impacts related to increasing the demand on fire protection/suppression services and emergency services, in addition to resulting in the placement of residences within terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities. The Revised Project also may result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department emergency Radio Communications System and contribute to cumulative fire protection demands. However, increasing the development from 234 units to 288 units would not significantly increase impacts over those analyzed in the 2002 EIR. Additionally, the Revised Project would implement Mitigation Measures KMM-3(b), KMM-5, KMM-6, and KMM-7, which would reduce fire protection impacts to a less than significant level. The Revised Project would also adhere to the two required measures requiring compliance with the City of Rocklin Construction Tax and the Uniform Fire Code. The Revised Project would not place residences farther than two road miles from the closest fire station and does not include open space; therefore, Mitigation Measures KMM-3(a) and KMM-4 are not required. Impacts would be consistent with those identified in the 2002 EIR.

Fire-related impacts resulting from the Revised Project would be mitigated to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation from the 2002 EIR. Impacts would be consistent with those identified in the 2002 EIR.

3.19.3 Wildfire Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures LMM-3(b), LMM-3(c), LMM-5, KMM-3(b), and KMM-5 through KMM-7 from the 2002 EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project and are provided below. The Revised Project would also adhere to the applicable required measures from the 2002 EIR related to fire hazard prevention, which are also provided below. Mitigation Measures LMM-3(a) and KMM-3(a) are specific to projects containing open space and are therefore not applicable to the Revised Project, and are not provided below. Additionally, the Revised Project would not place residents farther than two road miles from the nearest fire station, so Mitigation Measure KMM-4 is not applicable and is not provided below.

LMM-3(b) The project should conform to all State Responsibility Area (SRA) requirements. After annexation and prior to development, the Proposed Project developer(s) shall enter into a contract/agreement with the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (CDF) to provide wildland fire suppression services. Terms, conditions, and limits of said contract shall be reviewed and accepted by the City of Rocklin Fire Department (RFD). It shall be at the discretion of the RFD Fire Chief when such contract/agreement should terminate. Funding for this contract/agreement shall be the sole responsibility of the proposed project.

LMM-3(c) Implement Mitigation Measure KMM-5.

LMM-5 Implement Mitigation Measure LMM-3.

KMM-3(b) The City and project applicant shall analyze the cost of fire protection and emergency medical response associated with the project and develop a funding mechanism to offset any shortfall.

KMM-5 Where residential dwellings are developed, all portions of the exterior first floor shall be within 150 feet of the public right-of-way. Structures not capable of meeting this requirement shall be considered a special hazard and fire sprinkler systems shall be installed. This mitigation measure shall be implemented at the time of approval of the Building Permits.

KMM-6 The project applicant shall install Radio Repeater towers as needed within the project site. Specific sites will be determined by the Fire Department, in conjunction with design review approvals.

KMM-7 Implement Mitigation Measure KMM-3(b).

REQ-MM The timing for fire station construction shall be determined by the Rocklin City Council and shall be adequate to maintain desired service levels/response time to the project site. It is recommended that Fire Station #4 be constructed and staffed prior to full buildout.

REQ-MM Fire Flow requirements shall be met.

REQ-MM All roofs shall be fire resistive – Class-A type.

REQ-MM Development of the site shall be carried out in accordance with RFD rules and regulations and the Uniform Fire & Building Code Regulations adopted by the City of Rocklin.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the City of Rocklin Construction Tax (Section 3.16 of the Rocklin Municipal Code), for the acquisition and development of parks, open space, bike trails, public buildings, and fire equipment needed as a result of increased development within the City. This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of Building permit issuance.

REQ-MM The project applicant shall comply with the provisions of the Uniform Fire Code (adopted as Chapter 15.04 of the Rocklin Municipal Code). This mitigation measure to be implemented at the time of Building permit issuance.

4.0 CEQA DETERMINATION

Section 15164(a) of the Guidelines states the following:

> The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent EIR have occurred.

The proposed revisions to the 2002 EIR would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects due to substantial project changes or a substantial change in circumstances. Furthermore, new information associated with the proposed revisions does not indicate that the Revised Project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR; that significant effects previously examined would be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible; or that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternative. Therefore, an Addendum was prepared to comply with CEQA.

As the Lead Agency for the proposed Project revision, the City of Rocklin is issuing this Addendum in accordance with Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Director
City of Rocklin Community Development Department

5.0 REFERENCES

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2018. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette 06061C0933H. November 2.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2005. Tribal Consultation Guidelines Supplement to General Plan Guidelines. November 14.

Kimley Horn. 2021. Draft Access Evaluation, Terracina at Whitney Ranch Apartments, Rocklin, California. July 9.

Raney Planning & Management, Inc. 2021. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Terracina at Whitney Ranch Project. July.

Wallace Kuhl & Associates. 2019a. Geotechnical Engineering Report, Whitney Ranch. WKA No. 12369.02. September 4.

2019b. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Whitney Ranch Apartments Property. WKA No. 12369.01. August 2.