

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF ROCKLIN APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
(West Oaks RHNA Sites /GPA2021-0005, PDG2021-0004, PDG2021-0005, Z2021-0003, and
Z2021-0004)

WHEREAS, the City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator prepared an Initial Study on the West Oaks Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Sites General Plan Amendment, General Development Plan Amendment, and Rezone project (GPA2021-0005, PDG2021-0004, PDG2021-0005, Z2021-0003, and Z2021-0004) (the "Project") which indicated that there was no substantial evidence that the Project would have a significant effect on the environment; and

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

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Rocklin recommended that the City Council approve the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration on March 16, 2022 with a vote of 4-0 (one absence).

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Rocklin does resolve as follows:

Section 1. Based on the Initial Study and information received during the public review process, the City Council of the City of Rocklin finds that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 2. The negative declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City Council.

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

Section 4. The statements of overriding considerations adopted by the City Council when approving the City of Rocklin General Plan Update via Resolution No. 2021-152, adopted on August 24, 2021, are hereby readopted for the purposes of this negative declaration.

Section 5. A negative declaration of environmental impacts is recommended for approval for the Project.

Section 6. The Project Initial Study is attached as Attachment 1 and is incorporated by reference. All other documents, studies, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its decision are located in the office of the

Rocklin Community Development Director, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677. The custodian of these documents and other materials is the Rocklin Community Development Director.

Section 6. The negative declaration of environmental impacts included in the Project Initial Study is hereby approved for the Project.

Section 7. Upon approval of the Project by the City Council, the environmental coordinator shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of Placer County and, if the project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to the provisions of section 21152(a) of the Public Resources Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 adopted pursuant thereto.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of April, 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers:

NOES: Councilmembers:

ABSENT: Councilmembers:

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers:

Bill Halldin, Mayor

ATTEST:

Hope Ithurnburn, City Clerk



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF ROCKLIN
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, California 95677
(916) 625-5160

ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

West Oaks RHNA Sites General Plan Amendment, General Development Plan Amendment, and Rezone

GPA2021-0005, PDG2021-0004, PDG2021-0005, Z2021-0003 and Z2021-0004

There are three (3) project areas spanning eight (8) total parcels:

- A) Six (6) parcels at westerly terminus of West Oaks Blvd.; APNs 365-020-067, -068, -069, -070, -071, and -072.
- B) One (1) parcel at the northwest corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd., south of Atherton Road; APN 017-281-016.
- C) One (1) parcel at the northeast corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd.; APN 017-284-015.

February 18, 2022

PREPARED BY:

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

CONTACT INFORMATION:

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

APPLICANT/OWNER:

The applicant is the City of Rocklin.

The property owner of Area A (365-020-067 through -072) is Black Iris Properties LLC.

The property owner of Area B (017-281-016) is GTA Lonetree LLC.

The property owner of Area C (017-284-015) is Rocklin Corporate Center LLC.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

This Initial Study (IS) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3), and the City of Rocklin CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).

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

B. Document Format

This Initial Study is organized into five sections as follows:

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

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

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

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

Section 5, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this Initial Study. The reference materials are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and can also be found on the City's website under Planning Department, Current Environmental Documents.

C. CEQA Process

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

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

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

SECTION 2. INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY AND DETERMINATION

A. Summary Information

Project Title:

West Oaks RHNA Sites General Plan Amendment, General Development Plan Amendment, and Rezone

Lead Agency Name and Address:

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

Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Mohlenbrok, Environmental Coordinator/Community Development Director, 916-625-5162

Project Location:

There are three project areas, as follows:

Area A: Six (6) parcels at westerly terminus of West Oaks Blvd.; APNs 365-020-067, -068, -069, -070, -071, and -072. This area is located within the boundaries of the Sunset West General Development Plan.

Area B: One (1) parcel at the northwest corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd., south of Atherton Road; APN 017-281-016. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

Area C: One (1) parcel at the northeast corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd.; APN 017-284-015. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

Project Sponsor's Name:

The applicant is the City of Rocklin. The property owner of Area A (365-020-067 through -072) is Black Iris Properties LLC. The property owner of Area B (017-281-016) is GTA Lonetree LLC. The property owner of Area C (017-284-015) is Rocklin Corporate Center LLC.

Current General Plan Designation:

Area A: Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI)

Area B: Light Industrial (LI)

Area C: Light Industrial (LI)

Proposed General Plan Designation:

Area A: High Density Residential (HDR)

Area B: Mixed Use (MU)

Area C: Mixed Use (MU)

Current Zoning:

Area A: Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI)

Area B: Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP)

Area C: Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP)

Proposed Zoning:

Area A: Planned Development Residential, 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PDR-24+)

Area B: Mixed Use 24 Dwelling Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+)

Area C: Mixed Use 24 Dwelling Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+)

Description of the Project:

The Project is a City-initiated request for approval of a General Plan Amendment, two General Development Plan Amendments, and two Rezones to change the land use designations and zoning of eight parcels in the northwestern area of Rocklin to accommodate high density residential development, consistent with the recently certified City of Rocklin Housing Element 2021-2029. These modifications are required in order to comply with the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

This project does not include a specific development proposal for any of the sites, and as such it will not directly result in any construction activities or a direct physical change in the environment.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The three project areas are located in the northwest portion of Rocklin. Surrounding properties consist of various light industrial uses, large office uses, open space areas associated with the creek corridor, existing and proposed high density residential, a church facility, and Kathy Lund Park. To the west is State Route 65 with unincorporated Placer County properties located beyond.

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

- Rocklin Engineering Division approval of Improvement Plans
- Rocklin Building Inspections Division issuance of Building Permits
- Placer County Water Agency approval of construction of water facilities
- South Placer Municipal Utility District approval of construction of sewer facilities
- Placer County Air Pollution Control District approval of dust control plan
- Regional Water Quality Control Board issuance of Section 401 certification
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issuance of Section 404 permit
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service issuance of Streambed Alteration Agreement

B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture/Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | None | <input type="checkbox"/> | None with Mitigation Incorporated | | |

C. Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study:

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



David Mohlenbrok
Community Development Department Director

February 18, 2022

Date

SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

There are three project areas, as follows:

- A) Six (6) parcels at westerly terminus of West Oaks Blvd; APNs 365-020-067, -068, -069, -070, -071, and -072. This area is located within the boundaries of the Sunset West General Development Plan.
- B) One (1) parcel at the northwest corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd., south of Atherton Road; APN 017-281-016. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.
- C) One (1) parcel at the northeast corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd.; APN 017-284-015. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

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

B. Description

The project proposes to change the land use designation and zoning on the three project areas, which would facilitate future development of a multi-family community on Area A at a minimum of a 24 dwelling units per acre and a potential Mixed-Use development on Areas B and C. If residential development is proposed on Areas B and/or C, development would be required to be constructed at a minimum of 24 dwelling units per acre.

The project will require the following entitlements from the City of Rocklin:

- General Plan Amendment (GPA2021-0005) to change the land use of Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 017-281-015 and 017-284-016 from Light Industrial (LI) to Mixed Use (MU) and of APNs 365-020-067 through -072 from Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) to High Density Residential (HDR);
- General Development Plan Amendment (PDG2021-0004) to amend the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan to add the Mixed Use 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+) zoning district.
- General Development Plan Amendment (PDG2021-0005) to amend the Sunset West General Development Plan to add the Residential 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-R24+) zoning district.

- Rezone (Z2021-0003) of APNs 017-281-016 and 017-284-015 from Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP) to Mixed Use 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+).
- Rezone (Z2021-0004) of APNs 365-020-067 through -072 from Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) to Residential 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-R24+).

This project does not include a specific development proposal, as such it will not directly result in any construction activities or a direct physical change in the environment. However, for purposes of this CEQA analysis, because the project has the potential to result in a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, it is conservatively assumed that a multi-family residential community with 30 residential units per acre and associated site design, including parking and landscaping would be developed on the project site. It is likely that any future development would require additional land use entitlements and review by the City of Rocklin, including an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

Area A is comprised of six (6) parcels totaling 12.5 acres in size. The PD-R24+ zoning district requires a minimum of 24 dwelling units per acre, although it is anticipated that it would be developed at a higher density. Therefore, assuming a density of 30 dwelling units per acre, Area A could theoretically be developed with 375 dwelling units, as well as an approximately 15,000 square foot community clubhouse and 942 resident parking spaces, consistent with the Rocklin Municipal Code.

Area B is one (1) parcel totaling 6.55 acres in size. Area C is one (1) parcel totaling 6.74 acres in size. While the proposed Mixed Use 24 Units Per Acre (MU-24+) could allow for alternative mixed-use developments, if the sites are developed with a residential use component, they would both be required to be developed at a minimum density of 24 dwelling units per acre. Assuming a density of 30 dwelling units per acre, Area B could theoretically be developed with 196 dwelling units and Area C could theoretically be developed with 202 dwelling units. Alternatively, based on the floor area ratio referenced in the City's traffic model of 0.35 per acre for office and 0.25 per acre for retail commercial, Area B could potentially be developed with 99,861 square feet of office or 71,330 square feet of retail commercial, and Area C could potentially be developed with 102,758 square feet of office or 73,330 square feet of retail commercial.

It is anticipated that any future development of the site will involve clearing and grading of the site, trenching and digging for underground utilities and infrastructure, and ultimately the construction of new parking areas, driveways, buildings, and landscaping.

SECTION 4. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Later activities in the program must be examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
- (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. That later analysis may tier from the program EIR as provided in Section 15152.
 - (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no subsequent EIR would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. Whether a later activity is within the scope of a program EIR is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record. Factors that an agency may consider in making that determination include, but are not limited to, consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure, as described in the program EIR.
 - (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into later activities in the program.
 - (4) Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR.
 - (5) A program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with later activities if it provides a description of planned activities that would implement the program and deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. With a good and detailed project description and analysis of the program, many later activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required.

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

hours at the Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677 and can also be found on the City's website under Planning Department, Current Environmental Documents. The specific studies are listed in Section 5, References.

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

B. Significant Cumulative Impacts; Statement of Overriding Considerations

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

1. Air Quality:

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

2. Aesthetics/Light and Glare:

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

3. Traffic and Circulation:

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

4. Noise

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

5. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

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

6. Biological Resources

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

7. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

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

C. Mitigation Measures Required and Considered

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

D. Evaluation of Environmental Checklist:

- 1) A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

- 2) All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site elements, cumulative as well as project-level impacts, indirect as well as direct impacts, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) If a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.
- 4) Answers of "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" describe the mitigation measures agreed to by the applicant and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures and supporting explanation from earlier EIRs or Negative Declaration may be cross-referenced and incorporated by reference.
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, and the City intends to use tiering. All prior EIRs and Negative Declarations and certifying resolutions are available for review at the Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department. In this case, a brief discussion will identify the following:
 - a) Which effects are within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether such effects are addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis; and
 - b) For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

E. Environmental Checklist

| I. AESTHETICS | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project: | | | | | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | X | |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X | |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | | | X | | |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities. Therefore, there will be less than significant or no aesthetic impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the GPA/Rezone has the potential to allow for construction of various unit types. The future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 99,861 square feet of office park or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial (or some combination of the three) on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 102,758 square

feet of office park or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial (or some combination of the three) on the 6.74-acre Area C will change the existing visual nature or character of the project site and area. Although the type of development allowed through the proposed GPA/Rezone would either be changed to high density residential or allow the potential for high density residential development, the massing and scale of the existing allowed uses on each site under current land use and zoning designations would not differ significantly from the proposed high-density residential uses or potential high density residential, office, or retail commercial uses. The development of the project site would create new sources of light and glare typical of urban development. As discussed below, impacts to scenic vistas or viewsheds would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the visual character of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. When previously undeveloped land becomes developed, aesthetic impacts include changes to scenic character and new sources of light and glare (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.3-1 through 4.3-18). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Elements, and include policies that encourage the use of design standards for unique areas and the protection of natural resources, including open space areas, natural resource areas, hilltops, waterways and oak trees, from the encroachment of incompatible land use.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Scenic Vista - *No Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities or structures that would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the project's impact on scenic vistas is less than significant.

However, the GPA/Rezone has the potential to allow for construction of various unit types. The future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C would result in the construction of structures which would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings which will change the existing visual nature or character of the project site and area. The development of the project site would create new sources of light and glare typical of urban development. As discussed below, impacts to scenic vistas or viewsheds would not be anticipated.

While vacant or mostly vacant areas have a natural aesthetic quality, there are no designated scenic vistas within the City of Rocklin or Planning Area. Alteration of the vacant and undeveloped areas of the project site through the future development of the uses noted above would change the visual quality of the project site and surrounding area. However, since there are no designated scenic vistas, no impact would occur in this regard.

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

c. Visual Character – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities or structures that would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the project's impact on visual character is less than significant.

However, the future development of the three project areas as discussed above would result in the construction of structures that would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings.

Per Public Resources Code section 21071 (a) (2), the City of Rocklin is considered to be an urbanized area because although its population is less than 100,000 persons, the population of Rocklin and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities (the cities of Roseville and Lincoln) combined equals at least 100,000 persons. Although this project is requesting a change in land use and zoning from what was analyzed in the Rocklin General Plan EIR, the future development of multi-family residential complexes and/or the development of retail commercial or office uses is consistent with the overall urbanization of this site as contemplated and analyzed for this area of Rocklin within the Rocklin General Plan. The building structures associated with these types of uses which could be constructed in the future are anticipated to be of consistent height and scale with surrounding existing development including the nearby James Apartments and the Atherton Tech Center Business Park, and anticipated future development of the Lone Tree Apartments which is currently being processed, as well as other surrounding vacant properties; there are no unusual development characteristics of this proposed project or the future development multi-family residential complexes, retail commercial, or office uses which would introduce incompatible elements or create aesthetic impacts not considered in the prior EIR. Existing buildings in the area include one-, two- and three-story office buildings, one- story light industrial warehouse buildings and three-story buildings. These buildings and the anticipated future development of buildings within the nearby and adjacent light industrial and retail commercial land use designations are collectively all of similar size and scale to what could ultimately be developed at the proposed project site.

All development in the Rocklin Planning Area is subject to existing City development standards set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance which helps to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community. In addition, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would also be subject to the City's Design Review Guidelines which help to ensure that development form, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community. The proposed project and the future development of these uses at this project site would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The change in the aesthetics of the visual nature or character of the site and the surroundings is consistent with the surrounding existing development and the future development that is anticipated by the City's General Plan. As noted above, the General Plan EIR concluded that development under the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable aesthetic impacts and Statements of Overriding Consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these cumulative impacts. The proposed project and the future development the uses stated above at these project sites does not result in a change to the finding because the site could be developed in the future with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development.

d. Light and Glare – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities or structures

that would increase light and glare at the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the project's impact on light and glare is less than significant.

However, the future development at this project site would result in the construction of structures which would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings.

There are no specific features within the proposed project that would create unusual light and glare, and it is anticipated that the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would also not have any specific features that would create unusual light and glare. The future implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the General Plan policies addressing light and glare would also ensure that no unusual daytime glare or nighttime lighting is produced. However, the impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the Planning Area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated.

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X | |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))? | | | | X | |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X | |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., b. and e. Conversion of Farmland, Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act - No Impact. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities or structures that would potentially impact agriculture resources of the project site.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction of structures that would potentially impact agriculture resources of the project site.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) land classifications system monitors and documents land use changes that specifically affect California's agricultural land and is administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC). The FMMP land classification system is cited by the State CEQA Guidelines as the preferred information source for determining the agricultural significance of a property (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). The CDC, Division of Land Resource Protection, Placer County Important Farmland Map of 2018 designates the project sites as "grazing land". This category is not considered to be Important Farmland under the definition in CEQA of "Agricultural Land" that is afforded consideration as to its potential significance (see CEQA Section 21060.1(a)), nor are they considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance; therefore, the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Also, the project site contains no parcels that are under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, because the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of the uses noted above would not convert important farmland to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing agricultural or forestry use zoning or Williamson Act contracts, or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses, there would be no agricultural use impacts.

c. and d. Rezone or Conversion of Timberland, Forest Land— No Impact. The project sites do not contain any existing trees or parcels that are zoned as, or considered forestry lands or timberland. Therefore, because the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses on Areas B and C

a would not conflict with existing forestry use zoning or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, there would be no impact on forestry uses.

| III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project: | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan? | | | X | | |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | | | X | | |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | | |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities. Therefore, there will be less than significant air quality impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in air quality emissions. In the short-term, air quality impacts from the future development of the uses noted above at these project sites will result from construction related activities associated with grading and excavation to prepare the site for the installation of utilities and above ground structures and improvements. These air quality impacts will primarily be related to the generation of airborne dust (Particulate Matter of 10 microns in size or less (PM₁₀).

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

As discussed below, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would not be expected to create objectionable odors.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Raney Planning & Management, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (AQGHG) reports for all three project areas. The three reports, all dated February 2022, are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and are incorporated into this Negative Declaration by reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Raney Planning & Management, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Raney Planning & Management, Inc. report, which are summarized below.

Area A

Approved Conditions

The approved Conditions scenario refers to buildout of the project site consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations. Because the existing zoning allows for commercial uses, this analysis assumes commercial development rather than light industrial or office development to provide a maximum development analysis for automobile trip generation. As such, under the Approved Conditions scenario, the modeling assumes development of 136,125 square feet (sf) of commercial uses, as well as 681 parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Proposed Project

The analysis was prepared to estimate the criteria pollutant emissions from project construction and operation, assuming development of 375 multi-family dwelling units on Area A, as well as a 15,000 square foot community clubhouse, and 942 parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

It should be noted that the report also analyzed a 3.38-acre parcel located directly north of Area A, which was previously Caltrans right-of-way. It is anticipated that, at some point, this parcel would be redesignated and rezoned to allow future development. However, this parcel is not part of this project and therefore this Negative Declaration does not include any analysis of its development. If and when that project site is developed, further CEQA review would be required.

Regarding Area A, the short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of the future development of a 375-unit multi-family residential complex project at this project site were estimated using the CalEEMod modeling program. CalEEMod estimates the emissions that result from various land uses, and includes considerations for trip generation rates, vehicle mix, average trip length by trip type, and average speed. Where project-specific data was assumed, that data was input into the CalEEMod model (i.e., construction phases and timing, inherent site or project design features, compliance with applicable regulations, etc.)

Area B

Approved Conditions

Because the existing PD-IP zoning allows for office uses, this analysis assumes office development rather than light industrial development to provide a maximum development analysis for automobile trip generation. As such, under the Approved Conditions scenario, the modeling assumes development of 99,861 square feet (sf) of commercial uses, as well as 500 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Proposed Project

As previously discussed, the project is proposed to be rezoned to PD-MU-24+. This could allow the site to be developed as all residential (minimum 24 dwellings per acre), all nonresidential, or as some combination of residential and nonresidential. For the purpose of the AQGHG analysis, the site was analyzed with two different options, as follows.

- **Proposed Project Option 1 (Multi-Family Residential):** Proposed Project Option 1 assumes development of 196 multi-family dwelling units on-site, as well as a 15,000-sf community clubhouse, and 435 resident parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.
- **Proposed Project Option 2 (Mixed Use Development):** Proposed Project Option 2 assumes buildout of 50 percent commercial uses and 50 percent multifamily residential uses on-site for a total of 35,664 sf of commercial uses and 98 multi-family dwelling units, as well as an 8,000-sf community clubhouse, 218 resident parking spaces, and 184 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code (RMC) applicable to the three sites.

Area C

Approved Conditions

Because the existing PD-IP zoning allows for office uses, this analysis assumes office development rather than light industrial development to provide a worst-case analysis for automobile trip generation. As such, under the Approved Conditions scenario, the modeling assumes development of 102,758 square feet (sf) of commercial uses, as well as 514 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code (RMC) applicable to the three sites.

Proposed Project

As with Area B, the project is proposed to be rezoned to PD-MU-24+. This could allow the site to be developed as all residential (minimum 24 dwellings per acre), all nonresidential, or as some combination of residential and nonresidential. For the nonresidential portions of Option 2 of Areas B and C, “Office Park” is the most applicable land use subtype under the Commercial land use umbrella. The CalEEMod manual includes the following instructions: “Office Parks are usually suburban subdivision or planned unit development containing general office buildings and support services, such as banks, restaurants, and service stations, arranged in a park or campus-like atmosphere. *This land use should be used if details on individual buildings are not available* [emphasis added].” Because details on future individual buildings are not known at this time, consistent with that direction and, for the purpose of the AQGHG analysis, the site was analyzed with two different options, as follows.

- **Proposed Project Option 1 (Multi-Family Residential):** Proposed Project Option 1 assumes development of 202 multi-family dwelling units on-site, as well as a 15,000-sf community clubhouse, and 435 resident parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.
- **Proposed Project Option 2 (Mixed Use Development):** Proposed Project Option 2 assumes buildout of 50 percent commercial uses and 50 percent multifamily residential uses on-site for a total of 36,699 sf of commercial uses and 101 multi-family dwelling units, as well as an 8,000-sf community clubhouse, 218 resident parking spaces, and 184 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Construction Emissions

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

The future development projects on all three sites are required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including, but not limited to, the following, which would be noted with City-approved construction plans:

- Rule 202 related to visible emissions; Rule 217 related to asphalt paving materials; Rule 218 related to architectural coatings; Rule 228 related to fugitive dust, and Regulation 501 related to general permit requirements.

The AQGHG analysis found that the overall future development project's maximum daily emissions from construction operations would be as shown in the table below. It should be noted that, while this report analyzes the ultimate buildout of all three sites, it is extremely unlikely that all three project areas, which are each owned by different entities, would be developed at the same time. Therefore, the cumulative levels for construction emissions of all three projects are not applicable to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) significance thresholds.

| MAXIMUM UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (lbs/day) | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) | Nitrous Oxides (NO_x) | Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) |
| Maximum Daily Emissions | Area A | | |
| | 20.21 | 38.89 | 21.42 |
| | Area B | | |
| | 9.20 (Option 1) | 33.12 (1) | 21.41 (1) |
| | 6.55 (Option 2) | 33.12 (2) | 21.42 (2) |
| | Area C | | |
| | 14.67 (Option 1) | 33.12 (1) | 21.42 (1) |
| | 10.07 (Option 2) | 33.12 (2) | 21.42 (2) |
| Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds | 82.0 | 82.0 | 82.0 |
| Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold | No | No | No |

As shown, the future development project's short-term construction-related emissions are not anticipated to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ under all of the development scenarios. Therefore, construction activities associated with development of the future project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone and PM₁₀. Accordingly, construction of the proposed project would not violate any ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Operational Emissions

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

The future development projects on all three project sites are required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, such as those listed previously for construction, as well as the following for operations:

- Rule 205 related to nuisances, Rule 231 or Rule 247 related to commercial water heaters and boilers, Rule 502 related to review of new sources of emissions.

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

| MAXIMUM UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day) | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) | Nitrous Oxides (NO _x) | Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) |
| Maximum Daily Emissions | Area A | | |
| | 19.56 | 12.64 | 14.53 |
| | Area B | | |
| | 11.04 (Option 1) | 9.47 (1) | 5.48 (1) |
| | 7.70 (Option 2) | 6.37 (2) | 5.93 (2) |
| | Area C | | |
| | 11.95 (Option 1) | 11.03 (1) | 8.91 (1) |
| | 8.38 (Option 2) | 7.53 (2) | 6.70 (2) |
| Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 |
| Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold | No | No | No |

As shown, the future development project's operational emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance under all of the development scenarios. Accordingly, the future development project's operational emissions would not

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

Cumulative Air Quality

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

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

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

As shown in the Maximum Unmitigated Operational Emissions table above, the proposed project would result in the generation of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds.

The General Plan EIR identified a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan project and the future development of the three project areas would not result in a change to this finding because they do not result in short-term, long-term or cumulative air quality emissions that exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would generate air quality emissions. Therefore, the project's impact on conflicting or obstructing an air quality plan would be less than significant.

However, the future development of the three project areas as described above would result in construction and operational activities that would generate air quality emissions.

The proposed project area is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The SVAB is designated nonattainment for the federal particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) and the State particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) standards, as well as for both the federal and State ozone standards. The federal Clean Air Act requires areas designated as federal nonattainment to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures for states to use to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. In compliance with regulations, the PCAPCD periodically prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions via regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 2009 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Ozone Attainment Plan), updated July 24, 2017.

The Ozone Attainment Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the CAA requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the USEPA also strengthened the secondary 8-hour ozone NAAQS, making the secondary standard identical to the primary standard. The SVAB remains classified as a severe nonattainment area with an attainment deadline of 2027. On October 26, 2015 the USEPA released a final implementation rule for the revised NAAQS for ozone to address the requirements for reasonable further progress, modeling and attainment demonstrations, and reasonably available control measures (RACM) and reasonably available control technology (RACT). On April 30, 2018 the USEPA published designations for areas in attainment/unclassifiable for the 2015 ozone standards. The USEPA identified the portions of Placer County within the SVAB as nonattainment for the 2015 ozone standards. Due to the designation of the SVAB as nonattainment for the 2015 standards,

the PCAPCD will work with other regional air districts to prepare a new ozone SIP for the revised 2015 standards.

General conformity requirements of the regional air quality plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. In order to evaluate ozone and other criteria air pollutant emissions and support attainment goals for those pollutants that the area is designated nonattainment, the PCAPCD has recently proposed updates to the District's recommended significance thresholds for emissions of PM₁₀, and ozone precursors – reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). On October 13, 2016 the PCAPCD adopted updated thresholds of significance of the aforementioned pollutants.

| PCAPCD THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| POLLUTANT | CONSTRUCTION THRESHOLD (LBS/DAY) | OPERATIONAL THRESHOLD (LBS/DAY) |
| ROG | 82 | 55 |
| NO _x | 82 | 55 |
| PM ₁₀ | 82 | 82 |

Source: PCAPCD, 2017.

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

Through the combustion of fossil fuels, motor vehicle use produces significant amounts of pollution. In fact, the PCAPCD cites motor vehicles as a primary source of pollution for residential, commercial, and industrial development. Because motor vehicles emit air quality pollutants during their operations, changing the amount of motor vehicle operations in an area would change the amount of air pollutants being emitted in that area.

As shown in the Construction Emissions and Operational Emissions tables above, the future development of the three project areas would result in construction and operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ which would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. These thresholds take into account strategies for attaining air quality standards. Accordingly, the project's construction and operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and construction-related and operationally-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

For cumulative emissions, the PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions and the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's operational-level thresholds, the project could be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans, and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. As shown in the Operational Emissions table above, the future development of the three project areas would result in the generation of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds. Thus, the future development projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard and the impact would be considered less than significant.

c. Sensitive Receptors – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would generate air quality emissions that could potentially impact sensitive receptors.

However, the future development of the three project areas as described above would result in construction and operational activities that would generate air quality emissions that could potentially impact 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. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, childcare centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals and medical clinics. All three project areas have the potential to be developed with residential uses; thus, the projects could introduce sensitive receptors to the area. The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the three project areas are as follows:

- **Area A:** The nearest existing sensitive receptor are the multifamily residences located approximately 250 feet to the east of the project site, as well as two schools (Western Sierra Collegiate Academy, and Seavey Center) located approximately 500 feet to the north of the project site, as well as the South Placer County Jail, located approximately 350 feet to the west, across SR 65.
- **Area B:** The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are the multifamily residences located approximately 115 feet to the south of the project site, across West Oaks Boulevard.

- **Area C:** The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are the multifamily residences located approximately 235 feet to the southwest of the project site, across the West Oaks Boulevard/Lonetree Boulevard intersection.

Emissions of CO would result from the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels such as gasoline or wood and are particularly related to traffic levels. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadways are a direct function of traffic volume, speed and delay. Transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. However, under specific meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near roadways and/or intersections may reach unhealthy levels at nearby sensitive land uses, such as residential units, hospitals, schools, and childcare facilities. Thus, high local CO concentrations are considered to have a direct influence on the receptors they affect. It should be noted that as older, more polluting vehicles are retired and replaced with newer, cleaner vehicles, the overall rate of emissions of CO for vehicle fleet throughout the State has been, and is expected to continue, decreasing. Therefore, emissions of CO would likely decrease from current levels over the lifetime of the project.

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 more than 550 lbs/day of CO emissions and if either of the following scenarios are true, the project could result in localized CO emissions that would violate CO standards:

- Degrade the peak hour LOS on one or more streets or at one or more intersections (both signalized and non-signalized) in the project vicinity from an acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F); or
- Substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak hour LOS on one or more streets or at one or more intersections in the project vicinity. "Substantially worsen" includes an increase in delay at an intersection by 10 seconds or more when project-generated traffic is included.

However, considering that the law has changed with respect to how transportation-related impacts may be addressed under CEQA such that unacceptable LOS is no longer considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, this analysis relies on the 550 lbs/day of CO emissions screening criterion only.

According to the modeling performed for the proposed project, operations on the three project areas would be as follows:

- Area A would result in maximum mobile source CO emissions of 107.94 lbs/day.

- Area B would result in 56.22 lbs/day under Proposed Project Option 1 and 38.29 lbs/day under Proposed Project Option 2.
- Area C would result in 64.54 lbs/day under Proposed Project Option 1 and 44.53 lbs/day under Proposed Project Option 2.

Consequently, CO emissions related to operation of the proposed project would be below the 550 lbs/day screening threshold used by PCAPCD on an individual and cumulative level. Therefore, according to the PCAPCD's screening methodology for localized CO emissions, the proposed project would not be expected to generate localized CO emissions that would contribute to an exceedance of AAQS, and the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of localized CO.

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

For freeways and roads with high traffic volumes, Table 4-1 of the CARB Handbook recommends "Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day." Any project placing sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a major roadway or freeway may have the potential to expose those receptors to DPM. The edge of the nearest travel lane of State Route 65 (SR-65) is located approximately 50 feet west of Area A, 1,650 feet west of Area B, and 2,100 feet west of Area C at their closest points. However, because this project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal, it will not introduce any new sensitive receptors to the area. Thus, the project would not be subject to substantial DPM emissions associated with freeway traffic and risk levels from SR-65 would not expose new receptors to substantial health risk. Once a specific development application is made for Area A, an assessment of placing sensitive receptors within 500 feet of State Route 65 can be made, including any potential health risk assessments.

Due to the nature of the future development projects on these sites, relatively few vehicle trips associated with the projects would be expected to be composed of heavy-duty diesel-fueled trucks and their associated emissions. The projects would not involve any land uses or operations that would be considered major sources of TACs, including DPM, and the projects would not involve long-term operation of any stationary diesel engine or other on-site stationary source of

TACs. As such, the proposed projects would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations.

Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically DPM, from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. However, construction is temporary and occurs over a relatively short duration in comparison to the operational lifetime of a project. Only portions of the site would be disturbed at a time throughout the construction period, with operation of construction equipment occurring intermittently throughout the course of a day, rather than continuously at any one location on the project site. Operation of construction equipment within portions of the overall development area would allow for the dispersal of emissions, and would ensure that construction activity is not continuously occurring in the portions of the project site closest to existing sensitive receptors. In addition, all construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the State's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. The In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation includes emissions reducing requirements such as limitations on vehicle idling, disclosure, reporting, and labeling requirements for existing vehicles, as well as standards relating to fleet average emissions and the use of Best Available Control Technologies. Project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, particularly associated with permitting of air pollutant sources. In addition, construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and only portions of the site would be disturbed at a time. Considering the intermittent nature of construction equipment, the duration of construction activities, and the typical long-term exposure periods typically associated with health risks, the likelihood that any one sensitive receptor would be exposed to high concentrations of DPM for any extended period of time due to project construction would be low. Therefore, construction of the future development projects would not be expected to expose any nearby sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of DPM or other TACs.

Emissions of TACs related to operational activities are typically associated with stationary diesel engines of land uses that involve heavy truck traffic or idling. The future residential development is not expected to generate heavy truck traffic or involve the use of forklifts or other stationary diesel-fueled equipment. However, any potential future uses would be required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, including obtaining permits to operate, if any stationary diesel engines are proposed.

Based on the above discussion, proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of the three project areas as described above would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant.

d. Odors – Less Than Significant Impact. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would result in emissions (such as those leading to odors) that would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

However, the future development of the three project areas as described above would result in the construction and operational activities that would result in emissions (such as those leading to odors) that could adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. The proposed project does not involve such land uses nor is it located near any such land uses. Although less common, emissions of DPM from heavy-duty diesel truck traffic could result in objectionable odors. While the proposed project would increase the total amount of vehicle trips in the area, the increase in area vehicle activity would not necessarily create an increase in heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, because the traffic increase would mostly be a result of increased residential or office or retail commercial land uses. Residential, office and retail commercial land uses are not typically associated with high volumes of heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, and thus the increase in daily trips attributable to residential, office or retail commercial land uses would mainly involve single passenger vehicles that are not typically considered to be sources of objectionable odors.

Diesel fumes associated with diesel-fueled equipment and heavy-duty trucks, such as from construction activities or operations of emergency generators, could be found to be objectionable. However, as addressed above, construction is temporary and construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and would likely only occur over portions of the project area at a time.

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

Because the future development of the three project areas as described above would not include the development of odor-generating land uses or development in proximity to odor-generating land uses, because the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of passenger vehicles rather than heavy-duty diesel trucks, and considering the intermittent nature and short-term duration of construction activities, the future development projects would not be anticipated to result in the exposure of residences or other sensitive receptors to objectionable odors or result in other emissions such as those leading to the creation of

objectionable odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of the three project areas would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. Therefore, there will be less than significant biological resource impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C could modify habitats through the removal of native and other plant materials on the project site and impacts to special status animal and plant species could occur due to their presence or potential presence on the project site. Area A has already been graded and contains some building pads and a detention pond which were constructed as part of a previously approved, but now expired, project for which construction was started but not completed. It does not contain any oak trees or wetland areas. Based on aerial photo review and field observations, it appears that Areas B and C do not contain any trees, but potentially could contain seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools.

Prior Environmental Analysis

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

As noted above, there is no specific development proposal being made at this time and the project is just a General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment. It is most likely that any future development of the project site will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

When a future development proposal application is submitted to the City of Rocklin for review and processing, the below applicable General Plan policies from the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element will be applied to address the project's potential impacts to biological resources.

OCR-1 Encourage the protection of open space areas, natural resource areas, hilltops, and hillsides from encroachment or destruction through the use of conservation easements, natural resource buffers, building setbacks or other measures.

OCR-2 Recognize that balancing the need for economic, physical, and social development of the City may lead to some modification of existing open space and natural resource areas during the development process.

OCR-3 Define the actual limits of the conceptual dimensions for open space areas as depicted on the General Plan Land Use Diagram during processing of development projects.

OCR-5 Utilize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the primary regulatory tool for identifying and mitigating, where feasible, impacts to open space and natural resources when reviewing proposed development projects.

OCR-6 Look for opportunities to connect open space and natural areas to accommodate wildlife movement and sustain ecosystems and biodiversity.

OCR-7 Consult with other jurisdictions concerning open space planning programs, including the County's Placer Legacy program and other similar regional programs, to the extent possible.

OCR-11 Protect the groundwater recharge value of riparian and wetland areas while recognizing that minor modifications to such areas may be a necessary outcome of the development process.

OCR-15 Look for opportunities to establish linear parklands and/or open space areas that link open space and outdoor recreation areas, providing passage for pedestrians, bicycles, and wildlife.

OCR-24 Consider acquisition and development of small areas along creeks at convenient and safe locations of use by the general public.

OCR-27 Establish Class I bikeways where feasible along public roadways when roadways are adjacent to open space and parkland.

OCR-28 Integrate, to the extent practical, the City's bike and trails network with trails in adjacent jurisdictions and the region.

OCR-39 Require the protection of wetlands, vernal pools, and rare, threatened, and endangered species of both plants and animals through avoidance of these resources, or implementation of appropriate mitigation measures where avoidance is not feasible, as determined by the City of Rocklin.

OCR-40 Require compliance with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts and the Clean Water Act as conditions of development project approval.

OCR-41 Recognize that onsite protection of natural resources may not always be feasible and that offsite methods, such as use of mitigation banks, may be used.

OCR-45 Encourage development projects to incorporate natural resources such as creeks, steep hillsides, and quarries in restricted ownership by an appropriate entity that provides for the protection of the natural resource and also allows for access by the public, where appropriate.

OCR-46 Participate as appropriate in a regional approach to the management of drainage basins and flood plains with regional agencies such as the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

OCR-47 Protect the designated City Regulatory Floodplain from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants.

OCR-48 Promote, where appropriate, the joint use of creeks for flood control, open space, conservation of natural resources, and limited recreation activities.

OCR-49 Minimize the degradation of water quality through use of erosion control plans and Best Management Practices.

OCR-50 Maintain a grading ordinance that minimizes erosion and siltation of creeks and other watercourses.

OCR-51 Evaluate development along stream channels to ensure that it does not create any of the following effects in a significant manner: reduced stream capacity, increased erosion or deterioration of the channel.

OCR-53 Encourage measures promoting proper disposal of pollutants to the sanitary sewer or hazardous waste facilities rather than to the storm drainage system.

OCR-55 Consider the visual qualities of development projects and project compatibility with surrounding areas, especially when projects are proposed in urbanizing areas abutting rural or semi-rural areas where significant natural resource values exist.

OCR-57 Encourage urban design and form that conserves land and other resources.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Effect on Protected Species – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. Therefore, the project's effect on protected species is less than significant.

However, the future development of the three project areas as noted above would result in construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

b. and c. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Area A of the project site does not contain riparian habitat and wetlands since it was previously entitled, including environmental review under CEQA, and partly developed. Based on aerial photo review, it appears Areas B and C of the project site could potentially contain seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools. However, this project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological

resources. Therefore, the project's impacts on riparian habitat and wetlands is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. This would include an evaluation of whether there are in fact seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools located on Areas A and B and if affirmative, the City General Plan policies noted above would require either avoidance of the features or permitting and associated mitigation if any seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools are impacted by the future development projects.

d. Fish and Wildlife Movement – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. Therefore, the project's impacts on fish and wildlife movement is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

Wildlife corridors link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. The fragmentation of undeveloped land by urbanization creates isolated "islands" of wildlife habitat. Fragmentation can also occur when a portion of one or more habitats is converted into another habitat, such as when woodland or scrub habitat is altered or converted into grasslands after a disturbance such as fire, mudslide, or grading activities. Wildlife corridors mitigate the effects of this fragmentation by: (1) allowing animals to move between remaining habitats, thereby permitting depleted populations to be replenished and promoting genetic exchange and diversity; (2) providing escape routes from fire, predators, and human disturbances, thus reducing the risk of catastrophic events (such as fire or

disease) on population or local species extinction, and (3), serving as a travel routes for individual animals as they move within their home ranges in search of food, water, mates and other needs.

The three project areas are located in the northwest portion of Rocklin. Surrounding properties consist of various light industrial uses, large office uses, open space areas associated with the creek corridor, existing and proposed high density residential, a church facility, and Kathy Lund Park. To the west is State Route 65 with unincorporated Placer County properties located beyond.

The project sites are located within a mostly developed area that includes roads, existing residential, light industrial and office developments, but project site Area A is adjacent to a creek and riparian habitat. When project site Area A was previously entitled, including environmental review under CEQA, and partly developed, a creek and riparian buffer and open space area was established through the application of the above noted policies. To the degree that the creek and riparian area currently serve as a wildlife migration corridor, it is expected that the future project's preservation of the creek and riparian area will also preserve the ability for wildlife to use that corridor for movement. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and a future multi-family residential development on Area A are not anticipated to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites. Furthermore, this project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. Therefore, the project's impacts on fish and wildlife movement is less than significant.

e. Local Policies/Ordinances – No Impact. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. Therefore, the project's impacts regarding conflicts with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

The City of Rocklin General Plan policies OCR-42 and OCR-43 require all projects to mitigate for the loss of oak trees and the impacts to oak woodland that result from development. To comply with these policies, the City of Rocklin relies on the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Oak Tree Preservation Guidelines to determine project impacts and appropriate mitigation for the

removal of and construction within the dripline of native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 6 inches or more at 4.5 feet above ground level. Seven oak species and five hybrids between these species are defined as “native oaks” by the City. Per the City’s oak tree ordinance, the diameter at breast height (DBH) of a multiple trunk tree is the measurement of the largest trunk only, and heritage trees are defined as native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 24 inches or more.

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

There are no trees on the project site, including regulated oak trees. Although an arborist report was not submitted in association with the proposed project, it appears from review of aerial photos and field observations that there are no trees within the boundaries of the project site, including oak trees that would be regulated by the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. At the time that a future development is proposed, an assessment of whether the project site contains any oak trees regulated by the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance will be made, and if there are, mitigation per the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance will be required for any proposed oak tree removal. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

There are no facts or circumstances presented by the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project or a future multi-family residential, commercial, or office development project which create conflicts with other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore, there is no impact related to conflicts with local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources.

f. Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan – No Impact. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project or a future multi-family residential, commercial, or office development project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan because the site is not subject to any such plan; therefore there is no impact related to a conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical ground disturbance of the project site and any potential cultural resources that may be present. Therefore, there will be less than significant cultural resources impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C would result in ground disturbance which could potentially impact known or unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, sites and/or human remains as development occurs.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

cultural resources and the proper treatment and handling of such resources when they are discovered.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Historic Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site and its potential historic resources. Therefore, the project's impact on potential historic resources is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

b. Archaeological Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Although the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered cultural resources, because the proposed project does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical ground disturbance of the project site and any potential archaeological resources that may be present. Therefore, the project's impact on potential archaeological resources is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in the construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

c. Human Remains – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Although no evidence of human remains is known to exist at the project site, the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered human remains, but because the proposed project does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical ground disturbance of the project site and any potential human remains that may be present. Therefore, the project's impact to human remains is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in the construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its cultural resources. In the event that during future construction activities, human remains of Native American origin are discovered on the site during project demolition, it would be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall under the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resources Code Section 5097 *et seq.*). It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

| VI. ENERGY | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Would the project: | | | | | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | | | X | | |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated energy usage. Therefore, there will be less than significant energy impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would be anticipated to use energy resources, but it is anticipated such use would not be in a wasteful or inefficient manner, nor would such use conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur related to the cumulative demand for electrical and natural gas services as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included an increased demand for electrical and natural gas services, energy consumption impacts, and a cumulative increase in demand for electrical and natural gas services and associated infrastructure and increased infrastructure expansions to serve future development (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-34, pages 4.13-23 through 4.13-32 and pages 5.0-47 through 5.0-48). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Public Services and Facilities and Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage coordination with utility service providers and energy and resource conservation. The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in energy consumption impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through

the application of California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24), through the application of development standards contained in the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would reduce energy consumption, and through compliance with local, state and federal standards related to energy consumption.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated energy usage. Therefore, the project's impact on energy resources would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would be anticipated to use energy resources. The project would use energy resources for the operation (i.e., electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (i.e., gasoline, diesel fuel and electricity) generated by the project, and from off-road vehicles generated by and associated with the construction of the project.

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

demand and supply, and because PG&E plans for additional development within its service area, including the City of Rocklin.

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

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

Although it cannot be said with certainty at this time, the future development of the three project areas would be anticipated to be in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. In addition, energy providers are actively implementing measures to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and to improve energy efficiency. For example, PG&E is responsible for the mix of energy resources used to provide electricity for its customers, and it is in the process of implementing the Statewide Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) to increase the proportion of renewable energy (e.g. solar and wind) within its energy portfolio. Based on this requirement, PG&E is expected to procure at least 50% of its electricity resources from renewable energy resources by 2030. In 2016, renewable resources provided 33% of PG&E's electricity supply. Other Statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g. the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), would improve vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time.

For the above reasons, and although it cannot be said with certainty at this time, the future development of the three project areas would not be anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the project. The project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Rocklin, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Although improvements to City's pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems would provide further opportunities for alternative transit, the project would be linked closely with existing networks that, in large part, are sufficient for most residents or employees of the project and the City of Rocklin as a whole. For these reasons, and others (as described previously), the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in a less than significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and

review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to energy and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

b. Conflict or Obstruct with State or Local Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is not part of a state or local plan for renewable energy and the General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project itself does not, and the future development projects are not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for energy efficiency. As noted above, the future development projects would be required to comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project itself would have a less than significant impact with regard to conflicting with or obstructing a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The same would be anticipated with the future multi-family development project. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Branches of the Foothill Fault system, which are not included on the Alquist-Priolo maps, pass through or near the City of Rocklin and could pose a seismic hazard to the area including ground shaking, seismic ground failure, and landslides.

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities. Therefore, there will be less than significant geology and soils impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities which will involve clearing and grading of the site, which could render the site susceptible to a temporary increase in erosion from the grading and construction activities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for geology and soils impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan will

be applied to the future development projects. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City ordinances, rules and regulations.

In addition, the future development projects would be subject to the provisions of the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on or across the permit area; to comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites.

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., i. and ii. Fault Rupture, Ground Shaking – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would expose the buildings to potential geologic and seismic conditions. As noted above, a geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified engineer, will be required with the submittal of project improvement plans. The report will provide site-specific recommendations for the construction of all features of the building foundations and structures to ensure that their design is compatible with the soils, geology and seismic conditions of the project site. Therefore, the project's impact on soils, geologic and seismic conditions would be less than significant.

The City of Rocklin is located in an area known to be subject to seismic hazards, but it is not near any designated Alquist-Priolo active earthquake faults. The Foothill Fault System has been identified in previous environmental studies as potentially posing a seismic hazard to the area;

however, the Foothill Fault system is located near Folsom Lake, and not within the boundaries of the City of Rocklin. There are, however, two known and five inferred inactive faults within the City of Rocklin. Existing building code requirements are considered adequate to reduce potential seismic hazards related to the construction and operation of a future multi-family or office or retail commercial development project on the project sites to a less than significant level.

a., iii. and iv. Liquefaction, Landslides – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts. Therefore, the project's impact on geologic or soils impacts would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would which would expose the buildings to potential liquefaction and landslide conditions.

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

b. Soil Erosion – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts. Therefore, the project's impact soil erosion would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would which would expose the buildings to potential soil erosion conditions.

Standard erosion control measures are required of all projects, including revegetation and slope standards. The project proponent will be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications as a part of the City's development review process. The erosion and sediment control plan are

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

c. and d. Unstable and Expansive Soil – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts. Therefore, the project's impact on unstable and expansive soils would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would which would expose the buildings to potential unstable and expansive soil conditions.

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

e. Inadequate Soils for Disposal - *No Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts. Therefore, the project's impact on inadequate soils for disposal would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which would which would expose the buildings to potential inadequate soils for disposal conditions. Sewer service is available to the project site and future development projects will be served by public sewer. Septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be necessary; therefore, there are no impacts associated with the disposal of wastewater.

f. Paleontological Resource and Unique Geological Feature – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction activities and associated geologic or soils impacts. Therefore, the project's impact on paleontological resources and unique geological features would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction activities that could expose paleontological resources and unique geological features.

The project site and project area are not known or considered likely to contain a unique paleontological resource or a unique geological feature; therefore, direct or indirect impacts from a future development projects to these resources would be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, there will be less than significant greenhouse gas emissions impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which will include associated greenhouse gas emissions.

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

Area- and mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases would be generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project. Individual projects can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions by incorporating features that reduce vehicle emissions and maximize energy-efficiency.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

As discussed previously, the firm of Raney Planning & Management, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (AQGHG) reports for all three project areas. The three reports, all dated February 2022, are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and are incorporated into this Negative Declaration by reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Raney Planning & Management, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Raney Planning & Management, Inc. report, which are summarized below.

The analysis was prepared to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions from project construction and operation. The short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of the future development of the three project sites were estimated using the CalEEMod modeling program. CalEEMod estimates the emissions that result from various land uses, and includes considerations for trip generation rates, vehicle mix, average trip length by trip type, and average speed. Where project-specific data was assumed, that data was input into the CalEEMod model (i.e., construction phases and timing, inherent site or project design features, compliance with applicable regulations, etc.)

Greenhouse Gas Setting

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

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

The major concern is that increases in GHG emissions are causing Global Climate Change. Global Climate Change is a change in the average weather on earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the speed

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

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

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with 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 CO₂ equivalents (MTCO₂e/yr).

Regulatory Framework

In recognition of the global scale of climate change, California has enacted several pieces of legislation in 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 California Air Resources Board (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 reductions 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.

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

| PCAPCD OPERATIONAL GHG EFFICIENCY THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--------------|
| Efficiency Thresholds | | | |
| Residential (MT CO₂e/capita) | | Non-Residential (MT CO₂e/1,000 sf) | |
| Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural |
| 4.5 | 5.5 | 26.5 | 27.3 |
| <i>Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA, October 13, 2016.</i> | | | |

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

Proposed Project

As previously discussed, the project is proposed to be rezoned to PD-MU-24+. This could allow the site to be developed as all residential (minimum 24 dwellings per acre), all nonresidential, or as some combination of residential and nonresidential. For the purpose of the AQGHG analysis, the site was analyzed with two different options, as follows.

- **Proposed Project Option 1 (Multi-Family Residential):** Proposed Project Option 1 assumes development of 196 multi-family dwelling units on-site, as well as a 15,000-sf community clubhouse, and 435 resident parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code (RMC) applicable to the three sites.

- **Proposed Project Option 2 (Mixed Use Development):** Proposed Project Option 2 assumes buildout of 50 percent commercial uses and 50 percent multifamily residential uses on-site for a total of 35,664 sf of commercial uses and 98 multi-family dwelling units, as well as an 8,000-sf community clubhouse, 218 resident parking spaces, and 184 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Area C

Approved Conditions

Because the existing PD-IP zoning allows for office uses, this analysis assumes office development rather than light industrial development to provide a worst-case analysis for automobile trip generation. As such, under the Approved Conditions scenario, the modeling assumes development of 102,758 square feet (sf) of commercial uses, as well as 514 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Proposed Project

As with Area B, the project is proposed to be rezoned to PD-MU-24+. This could allow the site to be developed as all residential (minimum 24 dwellings per acre), all nonresidential, or as some combination of residential and nonresidential. The CalEEMod model manual provides guidance that office parks should be used for modeling purposes if details on individual buildings are not available. Because details on future individual buildings are not known at this time, consistent with that direction and, for the purpose of the AQGHG analysis, the site was analyzed with two different options, as follows.

- **Proposed Project Option 1 (Multi-Family Residential):** Proposed Project Option 1 assumes development of 202 multi-family dwelling units on-site, as well as a 15,000-sf community clubhouse, and 435 resident parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.
- **Proposed Project Option 2 (Mixed Use Development):** Proposed Project Option 2 assumes buildout of 50 percent commercial uses and 50 percent multifamily residential uses on-site for a total of 36,699 sf of commercial uses and 101 multi-family dwelling units, as well as an 8,000-sf community clubhouse, 218 resident parking spaces, and 184 commercial parking spaces, consistent with the existing zoning standards in the RMC applicable to the three sites.

Construction GHG Emissions

The following table presents the estimated unmitigated maximum construction-related GHG emissions for future projects on the three project areas:

| UNMITIGATED ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION GHG EMISSIONS (MTCO ₂ e/yr) | |
|--|-----------------------|
| | Maximum GHG Emissions |
| Area A | |
| | 907.95 |
| Area B | |
| (Option 1) | 686.19 |
| (Option 2) | 600.65 |
| Area C | |
| (Option 1) | 342.99 |
| (Option 2) | 305.91 |
| PCAPCD Significance Threshold | 10,000.00 |
| Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold | No |

As shown in the table above, the total maximum annual emissions related to implementation of the proposed projects would be well below the PCAPCD's bright-line threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr, even if construction on all three areas were to occur simultaneously. Therefore, project construction would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.

Operational GHG Emissions

The following table presents the estimated operational GHG emissions at full buildout for the future projects on the three project areas.

| Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions (MTCO ₂ e/yr) | |
|--|---|
| Emission Source | GHG Emissions |
| Area A | |
| Area | 4.68 |
| Energy | 364.77 |
| Mobile | 2,237.43 |
| Solid Waste | 129.75 |
| Water | 51.44 |
| Area B | |
| Area | Option 1: 142.21 Option 2: 71.11 |
| Energy | Option 1: 202.53 Option 2: 159.30 |
| Mobile | Option 1: 1,155.57 Option 2: 817.11 |
| Solid Waste | Option 1: 88.34 Option 2: 62.28 |
| Water | Option 1: 27.74 Option 2: 26.78 |
| Area C | |
| Area | Option 1: 149.56 Option 2: 73.29 |
| Energy | Option 1: 207.75 Option 2: 163.49 |
| Mobile | Option 1: 1,370.63 Option 2: 970.31 |
| Solid Waste | Option 1: 89.73 Option 2: 63.46 |
| Water | Option 1: 28.53 Option 2: 27.55 |
| TOTAL ANNUAL GHG EMISSIONS | Area A: 2,788.07 Area B (A): 1,616.39 Area B (B): 1,136.58 Area C (A): 1,846.2 Area C (B): 1,298.1 |
| PCAPCD Screening Level Threshold | 1,100 |
| PCAPCD Bright Line Threshold | 10,000 |

Because the proposed project would exceed the PCAPCD's screening level threshold, the project has been further evaluated in comparison with the efficiency thresholds presented above. The efficiency thresholds rely on MTCO₂e emissions per year per capita to determine significance for residential projects in rural or urban settings. In general, urban projects are considered to involve shorter vehicle trips, which would inherently reduce GHG emissions from mobile sources, while rural projects are considered to involve relatively longer vehicle trips and proportionally higher GHG emissions from mobile sources. In recognition of the inherent inequality between mobile source GHG emissions from rural and urban projects, PCAPCD established higher efficiency thresholds for rural projects as compared to urban projects. The PCAPCD directs lead agencies to determine whether a project is considered rural or urban. All three of the project areas are located in a primarily developed area that is considered to be urban. Additionally, the urban development threshold is a more stringent metric for comparison and, as such, the PCAPCD's urban development threshold is conservatively used for the following analysis.

The estimated emissions per capita for the proposed project are presented in the table below, and compared with the applicable PCAPCD efficiency threshold. As shown in the table, the proposed project would result in operational GHG emissions below the applicable PCAPCD efficiency threshold for all areas and options, and operations of the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.

| Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Project Area | Project Emissions | PCAPCD Efficiency Threshold for Urban Residential Projects |
| Area A | 2.60 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita | 4.5 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita |
| Area B | | |
| Option 1 | 2.88 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita | 4.5 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita |
| Option 2 | 4.04 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita | 4.5 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita |
| Area C | | |
| Option 1 | 3.19 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita | 4.5 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita |
| Option 2 | 4.49 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita | 4.5 MTCO ₂ e/yr/capita |

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b.) Generate Greenhouse Gas and Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would generate greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the project's impact on the generation of greenhouse gas emissions and conflict with a greenhouse gas plan would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that would generate greenhouse gas emissions.

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

Based on the information presented above, construction and operations of all three project areas would not be considered to generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment and, therefore, would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Consequently, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to impacts related to GHG emissions or climate change and the project's impact would be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, there will be less than significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities which will include associated potential hazards and hazardous materials.

As discussed below, the future development project's compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies and applicable City Code and compliance with applicable Federal, State and local laws and regulations would reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

In addition, Chapter 2.32 of the Rocklin Municipal Code requires the development of emergency procedures in the City through the Emergency Operations Plan. The Emergency Operations Plan provides a framework to guide the City's efforts to mitigate and prepare for, respond to, and recover from major emergencies or disasters. To implement the Emergency Operations Plan, the City has established a Disaster Council, which is responsible for reviewing and recommending emergency operations plans for adoption by the City Council. The Disaster Council plans for the protection of persons and property in the event of fires, floods, storms, epidemic, riot, earthquake and other disasters.

Significance Conclusion:

a. and b. Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials, Release of Hazardous Materials – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would generate hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, the project's impact on hazardous materials would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in construction and operational activities that could generate potential hazards or hazardous materials.

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

materials impact associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the future development projects.

c. Hazardous Emissions Near Schools – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would generate hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, the project's impact on hazardous emissions near schools would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C will result in the construction and operational activities that could generate potential hazards or hazardous materials.

There are two existing schools within one-quarter mile of the three project areas, namely the Western Sierra Collegiate Academy, located approximately 600 feet north of Area A and over 1,000 feet west of Areas B and C, and the Knowledge Tree Academy, located approximately 1,300 feet east of Area C. Although residential, office or retail commercial projects of this nature would not typically emit any significant amounts of hazardous materials, substances, or waste or be involved in the transportation of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, there are existing rules and regulations, as indicated above, that address hazardous materials management and environmental protection. Therefore, there is no impact related to hazardous emissions or hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.

d. Hazardous Site List – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities on a site that is potentially on the hazardous site list. Therefore, the project's impact on a hazardous site list location would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities on a site that is potentially on the hazardous site list.

The three project areas are not on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Government Code 65962.5 is known as the Cortese List. The Cortese database identifies public drinking water wells with detectable levels of contamination, hazardous substance sites selected for remedial action, sites with known toxic material identified through the abandoned site assessment program, sites with Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) having a reportable release and all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is known migration. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database were searched on February 1, 2022 and no

open hazardous sites were identified on the project sites; therefore, there is no impact related to a hazardous materials site on the project sites.

e. Public Airport Hazards – No Impact. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C are not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, there is no public or private airport hazard impact.

f. Emergency Response Plan – Less than Significant Impact. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would impair or interfere with an emergency operations plan. Therefore, the project's impact on an emergency response plan would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that could potentially impair or interfere with an emergency operations plan.

The City's existing street system, particularly arterial and collector streets, function as emergency evacuation routes. The design and layout of future development projects would not be anticipated to not impair or physically interfere with the street system emergency evacuation route or impede an emergency evacuation plan; therefore, a less than significant impact on emergency routes/plans would be anticipated. It is likely that any future development would require additional land use entitlements and review by the City of Rocklin, including an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

g. Wildland Fires – Less Than Significant Impact. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would impair or interfere with an emergency operations plan. Therefore, the project's impact on wildland fires would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that could potentially have wildland fire impacts.

The three project areas are located in a mostly developed area. Surrounding properties consist of various light industrial uses, large office uses, open space areas associated with the creek corridor, existing and proposed high density residential, a church facility, and Kathy Lund Park. To the west is State Route 65 with unincorporated Placer County properties located beyond. Additionally, the future development projects will be reviewed by the Rocklin Fire Department and will be designed with adequate emergency access for use by the Rocklin Fire Department to reduce the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires to a less than significant level. It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts from wildland fires and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

| X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Would the project: | | | | | |
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? | | | X | | |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | | | X | | |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | | | | | |
| i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | X | | |
| ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite; | | | X | | |
| iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or | | | X | | |
| iv) Impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X | | |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | | | X | | |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated hydrology and water quality impacts.

Therefore, there will be less than significant hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C would result in construction activities which would involve grading activities that would remove vegetation and expose soil to wind and water erosion and potentially impact water quality. Waterways in the Rocklin area have the potential to flood and expose people or structures to flooding. Additional impervious surfaces would be created with the development of the future development projects.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as well as relevant standards from the City’s Improvement Standards for hydrology and water quality impacts will be applied to the future development projects. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and

standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

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

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., b., c., and e. Water Quality Standards and Groundwater Management – *Less than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would impact water quality

standards or groundwater management. Therefore, the project's impact on water quality standards and groundwater management would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that could potentially impact water quality standards or groundwater management.

Storm water runoff from the future development projects sites will be collected in stormwater drainage pipes and then directed through water quality treatment devices/areas as Best Management Practices (BMP) and/or Low Impact Development (LID) features and then into the City's storm drain system. The purpose of the BMP/LID features is to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system. The purposes of the BMP/LID features are to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system and to provide opportunities for groundwater recharge. The City's storm drain system maintains the necessary capacity to support future development on the project site. Therefore, violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are not anticipated.

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

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

would be detrimental to the overall watershed, unless existing downstream drainage facilities cannot handle post-construction runoff from the project site. Substantial erosion, siltation or flooding, on- or off-site, exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems, substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or the impediment or re-direction of flood flows would not be anticipated to occur.

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

The project will use domestic water from the Placer County Water Agency and not use wells or groundwater; therefore, existing groundwater resources will not be depleted. The project site itself is not a substantial recharge area because of its smaller size in comparison to the overall groundwater recharge area. The City's policies of requiring new developments to retain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels and implementation of Low Impact Development features will ensure that groundwater recharge rates are also maintained at pre-development levels. Therefore, groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded or supplies decreased and conflicts with, obstruction of or impediment of a sustainable groundwater management plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

It is likely that any future development would require additional land use entitlements and review by the City of Rocklin, including an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective design standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

d. Release of Pollutants in Flood Hazard, Tsunami or Seiche Zones – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities that would impact water quality standards or groundwater management. Therefore, the project's impact on flood hazards, tsunami or seiche zones would be less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that could potentially impact flood hazards, tsunami or seiche zones.

The City's Flood Hazard Area Ordinance and City General Plan policies are designed to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions by having legally enforceable regulations that

are applied uniformly throughout the City to all publicly and privately-owned land within flood prone or flood related erosion areas. They allow the City to protect regulatory floodplains from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants, and they ensure that regulatory floodplains, based on the most current information, are not adversely affected by new development, both upstream and downstream. According to FEMA flood maps (Map Panel 0606061CO933H, effective date November 2, 2018), researched on February 1, 2022, the developable portions of all three of the project areas are located in flood zone X, which indicates that the project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and outside of the 500-year flood hazard area. The City's Flood Hazard Area Ordinance and City General Plan policies are designed to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions by having legally enforceable regulations that are applied uniformly throughout the City to all publicly and privately-owned land within flood prone or flood related erosion areas. They allow the City to protect regulatory floodplains from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants, and they ensure that regulatory floodplains, based on the most current information, are not adversely affected by new development, both upstream and downstream.

The project site is not located within the potential inundation area of any dam or levee failure, nor is the project site located sufficiently near any significant bodies of water or steep hillsides to be at risk from inundation by a tsunami or seiche. Therefore, the future development projects would be anticipated to not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones and a less than significant impact would be anticipated.

It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential impacts to flood hazards, tsunami or seiche zones and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

| XI. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------|--|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X | |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities. However, the project proposes to change the land use designation and zoning on the three project areas, which would facilitate future development of a multi-family community on Area A at a minimum of a 24 dwelling units per acre and of a potential Mixed-Use development on Areas B and C. If residential development is proposed on Areas B and/or C, development would be required to be constructed at a minimum of 24 dwelling units per acre.

Specifically, the following is requested as part of the project:

- General Plan Amendment (GPA2021-0005) to change the land use of Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 017-281-016 and 017-284-015 from Light Industrial (LI) to Mixed Use (MU) and of APNs 365-020-067 through -072 from Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) to High Density Residential (HDR);
- General Development Plan Amendment (PDG2021-0004) to amend the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan to add the Mixed Use 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+) zoning district.
- General Development Plan Amendment (PDG2021-0005) to amend the Sunset West General Development Plan to add the Residential 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-R24+) zoning district.
- Rezone (Z2021-0003) of APNs 017-281-016 and 017-284-015 from Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP) to Mixed Use 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (MU-24+).
- Rezone (Z2021-0004) of APNs 365-020-067 through -072 from Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) to Residential 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-R24+).

As discussed below, land use impacts are not anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding land use impacts.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Division of Community – *No Impact*. The three project areas are vacant, although there was some preliminary development activity and construction of building pads on Area A as part of a previously-approved project, which was not completed and the entitlements for which have since expired. All three project areas are within the City of Rocklin. The proposed General Plan Amendment/Rezone General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there is no division of community impact.

b. Plan, Policy or Regulation Conflict – *Less than Significant Impact*. As previously discussed, the project site is separated into three areas. Area A (APNs 365-020-067 through -072) is designated Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI) in the Sunset West General Development Plan. Areas B (APN 017-281-016) and C (APN 017-284-015) are designated Light Industrial (LI) on the General Plan land use map and are zoned Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP) in the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

The project requires General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment entitlements to allow for a future multi-family residential and/or mixed-use development projects on these three project areas. Upon approval of the entitlements noted above, future development projects would be consistent with the site's land use and zoning designations and would be compatible with the existing and future development of light industrial, commercial, office, high density residential and open space uses in the project vicinity. Business Professional and light industrial uses in the vicinity are all conducted largely indoors so the introduction of residential uses in this area is not anticipated to result in any land use conflicts with those existing uses. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment/Rezone General

Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with land use plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Redesignation and Rezoning of these sites is actually necessary to implement the City's recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Mineral Resources – No Impact. The Rocklin General Plan and associated EIR analyzed the potential for “productive resources” such as, but not limited to, granite and gravel (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.6-4 through 4.6-5 and 4.6-17). The City of Rocklin planning area has no mineral resources as classified by the State Geologist. The Planning Area has no known or suspected mineral resources that would be of value to the region and to residents of the state. The project site is not delineated in the Rocklin General Plan or any other plans as a mineral resource recovery site. Mineral resources of the project site have not changed with the passage of time since the General Plan EIR was adopted. Based on this discussion, the proposed General Plan Amendment/Rezone General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C are not anticipated to have a mineral resources impact.

| XIII. <u>NOISE</u> Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards? | | | X | | |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X | | |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or operational activities and associated noise impacts. Therefore, there will be less than significant or no noise impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities which would result in the generation of noise and the potential for the future project to expose to residents to noise levels from surrounding noise sources.

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

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Background Information on Noise

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

and the way the human ear perceives sound and for this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment.

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

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

The City of Rocklin General Plan includes criteria for stationary (non-transportation) and transportation noise sources. Because the proposed project is located within close proximity to State Route (SR) 65 and other roadways, the discussion below focuses on whether roadway noise levels would exceed City of Rocklin exterior or interior noise level standards at the residences of the project. For transportation noise sources, the maximum allowable exterior noise level standard for outdoor activity areas is 60 dB L_{dn} and the maximum allowable interior noise level standard is 45 dB L_{dn} .

Traffic Noise

Traffic data representing annual average traffic volumes for existing conditions were obtained from Caltrans and the General Plan EIR traffic consultant, DKS Associates. Using this data and the FHWA methodology, traffic noise levels as defined by L_{dn} were calculated for existing and future traffic volumes. Distances from the centerlines of selected roadways to the 60 and 65 dB L_{dn} contours are summarized in Table 4-11 and Table 4-12 of the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element. Table 4-12 shows the future traffic noise levels based upon the year 2030. The results of the analysis are based upon inputs to the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108). Traffic volumes used for this analysis were obtained from the General Plan EIR traffic analysis, and the potential noise impacts from traffic were evaluated based on Predicted 2030 Traffic Noise Levels from the City of Rocklin General Plan EIR noise analysis. The predicted noise levels were compared to noise level performance criteria for transportation noise sources contained within the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element.

It should be noted that the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard applies specifically to outdoor use areas or “outdoor activity” areas, which in the future project’s case are any anticipated outdoor areas of the project. The distance calculated between the centerline of State Route 65 (SR65) and a predicted noise level measurement of 60 dB was 2,332 feet. Area A is located adjacent to SR65. Therefore, it is anticipated that noise impacts from SR65 to the residents of a future multi-family residential development project would be above the City’s threshold. An acoustical analysis would be required to specifically analyze potential noise impacts for a future multi-family residential development project.

Sensitive Receptors

Noise sensitive receptors include residences, schools, hospitals, churches and similar uses that are sensitive to noise. Sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the project site include the James Apartments located approximately 100 feet to the south/southwest of Areas B and C and approximately 250 feet east of Area A, St. Matthew Lutheran Church located approximately 100 feet to the south/southeast of Areas B and C, the Western Sierra Collegiate Academy, located approximately 600 feet north of Area A approximately 1,000 feet west of Area B, and the Knowledge Tree Academy, located approximately 1,300 feet east of Area C. A future multi-family residential development project itself would also be introducing noise sensitive receptors due to the residential nature of the project.

Interior Traffic Noise Levels

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

Vibration Levels

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

| REPRESENTATIVE VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| Equipment | | Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)_ | Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)_ |
| Pile Driver (impact) | upper range | 1.518 | 2.121 |
| | typical | 0.644 | 0.900 |
| Pile Driver (sonic) | upper range | 0.734 | 1.026 |
| | typical | 0.170 | 0.238 |
| Vibratory Roller | | 0.210 | 0.293 |
| Large Bulldozer | | 0.089 | 0.124 |
| Loaded Trucks | | 0.076 | 0.106 |
| Jackhammer | | 0.035 | 0.049 |
| Small Bulldozer | | 0.003 | 0.004 |
| Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006 | | | |
| Note: Vibration levels at 20 feet were calculated using the equation provided by FTA that may be used to estimate vibration at different distances based on a reference ppv at 25 feet for various construction equipment. | | | |

Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. The effects of ground vibration may be imperceptible at the lowest levels, low rumbling sounds and detectable vibrations at moderate levels, and slight damage to nearby structures at the highest levels.

At the highest levels of vibration, damage to structures is primarily architectural (e.g., loosening and cracking or plaster or stucco coatings) and rarely results in structural damage. For most structures, a peak particle velocity (ppv) threshold of 0.5 inch per second or less is sufficient to avoid structural damage. The Federal Transit Administration recommends a threshold of 0.5 ppv for residential and commercial structures, 0.25 ppv for historic buildings and archaeological sites, and 0.2 ppv for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Generation of Noise or Vibration – *Less than Significant Impact.* The primary goal for the City of Rocklin General Plan with respect to noise is: “To protect City residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise”. To implement that goal, the City has adopted Noise Compatibility Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Noise Control. The objective of the Noise Compatibility Guidelines is to assure that consideration is given to the sensitivity to noise of a proposed land use in relation to the noise environment in which it is proposed to be located.

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

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any physical disturbance of the project site or in the generation of any noise or vibration. Therefore, the project's impact on the generation of noise or vibration is less than significant.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in the construction and operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and the generation of noise or vibration as well as the potential exposure of future residents to noise levels above City thresholds. As noted above, exterior noise levels at any outdoor activity areas for a future multi-family development project are predicted to exceed the City's 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level and could exceed the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard as well.

It is most likely that any future development of the project sites will require additional land use entitlements (i.e., at minimum a design review entitlement) and review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential noise impacts through an acoustical analysis and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. If it is determined that a future development project does not require land use entitlements from the City of Rocklin, the project would still be reviewed to ensure consistency with Rocklin General Plan goals and policies, any applicable objective noise standards, and an evaluation of potential environmental impacts which would include an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document.

Construction and operation of a future development projects would not be expected to involve the use of any equipment or processes that would result in potentially significant levels of ground vibration. The closest structures to the project site are more than 100 feet from project construction. As shown in the Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment table above, the predicted vibration levels from vibratory rollers, bulldozers, loaded trucks and jackhammers at a distance of 20 feet would not exceed the 0.5 ppv threshold for residential and commercial structures. Therefore, the generation of excessive groundborne vibration is anticipated to be less than significant with the future development projects.

c. Public and Private Airport Noise – No Impact. The City of Rocklin, including the project site, is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airport, and is therefore not subject to excessive aircraft noise related to airport operations. Therefore, there is no airport related noise impact associated with the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment nor will there be one with a future multi-family or mixed-use development project.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of residences. Therefore, there will be less than significant population and housing impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities which would result in an increase in population and housing at the project sites. But, the future development projects would not be anticipated to induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace substantial numbers of people or housing.

Redesignation and Rezoning of these sites is necessary to implement the City's recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element and will assist the City in part in meeting its current Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Population Growth – *Less than Significant Impact.* Area A of the project site is currently designated on the City’s General Plan land use map as Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PB/C/LI) and Areas B & C are currently designated as Light Industrial (LI). The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the designation of Area A to High Density Residential (HDR) and of Areas B & C to Mixed Use (MU). However, because nothing would be constructed at this time, there would be a less than significant population growth impact.

The future development of 375 dwelling units on the 12.5-acre Area A, 196 dwelling units or up to 71,330 square feet of retail commercial/99,861 square feet of office on the 6.55-acre Area B, and 202 dwelling units or up to 73,330 square feet of retail commercial/102,758 square feet of office on the 6.74-acre Area C would not be considered to induce substantial unplanned population growth into a City that is projected to have approximately 29,283 dwelling units at the buildout of the General Plan (the future development projects potential 773 dwelling units equates to 2.6 percent of the anticipated 29,283 Citywide dwelling units). Therefore, the future development projects will have a less than significant population growth impact.

b. Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing People or Housing – *Less Than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction. Therefore, there will be less than significant population and housing impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in an increase in population and housing at the project site. However, the future development projects would not be anticipated to displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing. The project sites are currently vacant therefore, it will not result in the displacement of

substantial numbers of existing people or housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, the impact would be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residences. Therefore, there will be less than significant public services impacts with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of the projects upon completion which would could create a need for the provision of new and/or expanded public services or facilities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Fire Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a

specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units. Therefore, there will be less than significant fire protection impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction and occupation of residential and potentially retail commercial and office structures that would require fire protection services.

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

a. Police Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units. Therefore, there will be less than significant police protection impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential and potentially retail commercial and office units that would require police protection services.

The future development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and equipping of the police station within the City of Rocklin. Future development of the project could increase the need for police patrol and police services to the site. Funding for police services is primarily from the general fund, and is provided for as part of the City's budget process. The future development projects would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure police protection services to the site and reduce police protection impacts to less than significant.

a. Parks – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any

residential units. Therefore, there will be less than significant parks impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would generate additional usage of parks. There are two existing developed community parks (i.e., Kathy Lund and Margaret Azevedo) located within 0.75 mile of the project site. Multi-family projects also routinely incorporate on-site recreation features.

The future development of this project sites has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City of Rocklin. Development of the future projects could increase the use of nearby park and recreation facilities. Funding for park and recreation facilities development and maintenance is primarily from the development fees, the general fund and financing districts, and is provided for as part of the City's budget process. The future development projects would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure the construction and maintenance of park and recreation facilities and reduce impacts to parks to less than significant.

a. Schools and Other Public Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units. Therefore, there will be less than significant schools and other public facilities impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would require schools and other public facilities services.

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

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of residences. Therefore, there will be a less than significant recreation impact with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, which mitigates these impacts to a less than significant level. Multi-family projects also typically include some type of recreational amenities onsite for their residents, which also helps offset in part the demand for recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Increase Park Usage and Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units. Therefore, there will be less than significant increase in park usage and construction or expansion of recreational facilities impacts associated with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that could result in an increase in park usage and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. But, a future multi-family residential development is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities because the City of Rocklin provides parkland dedication and/or collection of park fees to mitigate for the increased recreational impacts of new residential developments at the time that a parcel or subdivision map is recorded or building permits are issued for multi-family units. It would be anticipated that a future multi-family residential development project would include recreational amenities such as a pool, recreation room and outdoor spaces, but even so the residents of a future multi-family residential projects would likely utilize City recreational facilities but the use is anticipated to be minimal and is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of existing facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor is the minimal use anticipated to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Any impact on City recreational facilities would be mitigated by the requirement that the project pay standard Park Development fees and annex into the appropriate maintenance districts. Therefore, the future development projects would have less than significant impacts regarding the increase in use of recreational facilities.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of residences. Therefore, there will be a less than significant transportation impact with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C could result in transportation impacts.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Circulation Element, and include policies that require the monitoring of traffic on City streets to determine improvements needed to maintain an acceptable level of service, updating the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and traffic impact fees, providing for inflationary

adjustments to the City's traffic impact fees, maintaining a minimum level of service (LOS) of "C" for all signalized intersections during the PM peak period on an average weekday, maintaining street design standards, and interconnecting traffic signals and consideration of the use of roundabouts where financially feasible and warranted to provide flexibility in controlling traffic movements at intersections.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

As stated previously, there is no development project on any of the three project areas at this time and therefore a specific number of units is not yet known. Although the minimum units per acre that would be allowed under the proposed zoning is 24, the trip generation rates were run using an assumption of 30 dwelling units per acre for Area A. Trip generation rates for Areas B and C were run using an assumption of 30 dwelling units per acre for Option 1 of both areas. Trip generation rates for Areas B and C were also run using an assumption of 50 percent at 30 dwelling units per acre and 50 percent nonresidential uses for Option 2 of both areas.

For the nonresidential portions of Option 2 of Areas B and C, "Office Park" is the most applicable land use subtype under the Commercial land use umbrella. The CalEEMod manual includes the following instructions: "Office Parks are usually suburban subdivision or planned unit development containing general office buildings and support services, such as banks, restaurants, and service stations, arranged in a park or campus-like atmosphere. *This land use should be used if details on individual buildings are not available* [emphasis added]."

Trip Generation Comparison

An analysis of the trip generation yields that would result from the development of the Rocklin Corporate Center General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment

site was prepared. The analysis used trip rates that are incorporated in the Rocklin Travel Demand Model for purposes of estimating the Average Daily Trips (ADT) associated with the current land use and zoning designations and comparing that to what would theoretically be generated by the re-designation and rezoning to High Density Residential and Residential 24+ units per acre.

Although the minimum units per acre that would be allowed under the proposed zoning is 24, the trip generation rates were run using an assumption of 30 dwelling units per acre since there is no development project at this time and therefore a specific number of units is not yet known.

Square footage and Average Daily Trip (ADT) calculations were prepared for the current land uses, assuming office park as the most intensive permitted use, and then comparing that ADT with the ADT that would be generated if the sites were designated as High Density Residential (HDR)/Residential 24 unit per acre minimum (the calculations assumed a yield of 30 dwelling units per acre). Alternatively, based on the floor area ratio referenced in the City's traffic model of 0.35 per acre for office park, Area B could potentially be developed with 99,861 square feet of office park, and Area C could potentially be developed with 102,758 square feet of office park.

Area A

Under the current land use designation, **3,374 ADT** are anticipated (12.5 acres x 43,560 square feet = 544,500 total site square footage x 0.35 floor to area ratio = 190,575 square feet actual building size). The trip rate for office uses in the Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 17.7 per 1,000 square feet, therefore $17.7 \text{ Trips} \times 190.6 = 3,373.62$.

Under the proposed High-Density Residential land use designation, **2,438 ADT** are anticipated (12.5 acres x 30 dwelling units per acre = 375 multi-family units). The trip rate for multi-family uses in the Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 6.5 Trips per dwelling unit, therefore $375 \text{ units} \times 6.5 \text{ trips per unit} = 2,438 \text{ ADT}$.

Area B

Under the current land use designation, **1,768 ADT** are anticipated (6.55 acres x 43,560 square feet = 285,318 total site square footage x 0.35 floor to area ratio = 99,861 square feet actual building size). The trip rate for office uses in Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 17.7 per 1,000 square feet, therefore $17.7 \text{ Trips} \times 99.9 = 1,768.23$.

Option 1

Under the Mixed-Use land use designation, assuming the 100 percent residential buildout of Option 1, **1,281 ADT** are anticipated (6.55 acres x 30 dwelling units per acre = 197 units). The trip rate for multi-family uses in the Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 6.5 Trips per dwelling unit, therefore $197 \text{ units} \times 6.5 \text{ trips per unit} = 1,281 \text{ ADT}$.

Option 2

Under the Mixed-Use land use designation, assuming a 50 percent residential buildout and 50 percent nonresidential buildout, **1,527 ADT** could be anticipated. This assumes that residential development at 30 dwellings per acre on half of the site would yield 99 units ($197 / 2 = 99$) therefore resulting in an ADT of 644 ($99 \times 6.5 = 643.5$). This also assumes that 50 percent nonresidential buildout on half of the site would yield 49,931 square feet of building size ($99,861 / 2 = 49,931$) therefore resulting in an ADT of 883 ($17.7 \text{ Trips} \times 49.9 = 883.23$).

Area C

Under the current land use designation, **1,818 ADT** are anticipated ($6.74 \text{ acres} \times 43,560 \text{ square feet} = 293,594 \text{ total site square footage} \times 0.35 \text{ floor to area ratio} = 102,758 \text{ square feet actual building size}$). The trip rate for office uses in Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 17.7 per 1,000 square feet, therefore $17.7 \text{ Trips} \times 102.7 = 1,818 \text{ ADT}$).

Option 1

Under the High-Density Residential land use designation, **1,313 ADT** are anticipated ($6.74 \text{ acres} \times 30 \text{ dwelling units per acre} = 202 \text{ units}$). The trip rate for multi-family uses in the Rocklin Travel Demand Model is 6.5 Trips per dwelling unit, therefore $202 \text{ units} \times 6.5 \text{ trips per unit} = 1,313 \text{ ADT}$.

Option 2

Under the Mixed-Use land use designation, assuming a 50 percent residential buildout and 50 percent nonresidential buildout, **1,567 ADT** are anticipated. This assumes that residential development at 30 dwellings per acre on half of the site would yield 101 units ($202 / 2 = 101$) therefore resulting in an ADT of 657 ($101 \times 6.5 = 656.5$). This also assumes that 50 percent nonresidential buildout on half of the site would yield 51,379 square feet of building size ($102,758 / 2 = 51,379$) therefore resulting in an ADT of 910 ($17.7 \text{ Trips} \times 51.4 = 909.7$).

Combined Total (Areas A, B, and C together) ADT Comparison:

Existing Land Use Yield

| | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Area A: | 3,374 |
| Area B: | 1,768 |
| Area C: | 1,818 |
| Total: | 6,960 total ADT |

Proposed Land Use Yield

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Area A: | 2,438 |
| Area B: | 1,281 – 1,527 |
| Area C: | 1,313 – 1,567 |
| Total: | 5,032 – 5,532 total ADT |

When looking at all sites combined, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment would result in the generation of between 1,428 and 1,928 fewer Average Daily Trips (ADT) (a 20 - 27% reduction in trips per day) than what would be generated if the site were to be developed under the current land use designation and zoning.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Conflict with Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System – *Less than Significant Impact.* This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units and the resultant generation of vehicle trips. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact with regard to conflicts with a program, plan, or policy addressing the circulation system from the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of the uses described at these three project areas would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would result in vehicle trips being generated which could result in conflicts with a program, plan, or policy addressing the circulation system. The City's circulation system has been designed and sized for the ultimate build-out of the City's land uses per the General Plan, and potential circulation impacts from build-out have been analyzed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR. Based upon the trip generation comparison information above that shows fewer anticipated trips from the General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment, the future development projects are not anticipated to result in circulation impacts beyond the anticipated circulation and trip generation impacts analyzed and disclosed in the General Plan EIR. Although increases in delays at local intersections will occur due to the newly generated trips, capacity or level of service impacts from the future multi-family residential development project are not anticipated.

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

roadway improvements, so that the City's General Plan Circulation policies and quality of life can be maintained.

South Placer Regional Transportation Authority

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

Highway 65 Interchange Improvement Fee

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

Development of these project areas would not be anticipated to result in project-specific significant effects as demonstrated by the trip generation comparison and summary of the project's potential circulation impacts presented above. Because the above analysis has verified that the project will result in less vehicle trip generation and should not result in any significant circulation impacts more severe than those disclosed in the General Plan EIR, the City finds pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (C) (4), that these cumulative "environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR." Additionally, payment of traffic impact fees as described above will keep traffic impacts from the future development projects at a less than significant level and the project will not conflict with programs, plans, or ordinances addressing the circulation system nor would it conflict with the City's Level of Service policy addressing the circulation system.

The City of Rocklin seeks to promote the use of public transit through development conditions requiring park-and-ride lots, and bus turnouts. Bike lanes are typically required along arterial and collector streets. In the vicinity of the project there are existing Class II bike facilities on Atherton Road, Lonetree Boulevard and West Oaks Boulevard adjoining the project. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project does not conflict with these bike lane locations or with other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation and the future development projects is not anticipated to create conflicts either. Transit service

in the project vicinity is provided by Placer County Transit (PCT). The bus route closest to the project site is the Lincoln/Rocklin/Sierra College which runs a continuous route between Lincoln and Sierra College, with stops nearest the project site being at Sunset Boulevard/Lonetree Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road, and Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project does not conflict with these bus route or stop locations or other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation and the future development projects are not anticipated to create conflicts either. The future development projects will be evaluated by City staff to assess potential conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and whether proposed projects would decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant alternative modes of transportation impact and the future development projects is not anticipated to conflict with programs, plans, ordinances or policies related to transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

The City of Rocklin's Zoning Ordinance contains off-street parking requirements for different types of development projects. There is no development proposal at this time, but it is expected that when the future development application comes forward the project will comply with the City's parking requirements per the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, a parking supply impact is not anticipated.

b. Conflict or Inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program – *Less Than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units and the resultant generation of vehicle trips. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact with regard to conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program from the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of the uses described above at these three project areas would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would result in vehicle trips being generated which could result in a conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program.

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which was signed by Governor Brown on September 27, 2013, created a process to change the way transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA by moving away from the more traditional traffic flow and delay metric of Level of Service (LOS) to an alternative metric known as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) is a transportation performance metric that is used as an input to air quality and noise analyses. VMT not only addresses the number of trips generated by a given land use, but also the length of those trips. By doing so, the placement of a given land use in proximity to complementary land uses, and available transit, walking and bicycling facilities are all considered. VMT can also be used to quantify the effects of proposed changes to a roadway network, transportation demand

strategies, and investments in non-auto travel modes. VMT may be expressed in absolute numbers of as “per capita” rations, such as VMT per person, household, dwelling unit, employee, or service population (persons plus employees). The requirement to incorporate VMT as a metric in CEQA documents became effective on December 28, 2018 with the addition of section 15064.3 to the CEQA Guidelines. Per section 15064.3 (c), the provisions of section 15064.3 applied statewide, beginning on July 1, 2020.

In 2018, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency promulgated and certified CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 to implement Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2). Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) states that, “upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicle capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any.”

Subsequent to the certification of the CEQA Guidelines, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018). OPR’s advisory document identifies a potential approach which an agency could utilize as the basis for determining significant transportation impacts. Specifically, the OPR technical guidance recommends consideration of whether the project is consistent with the applicable Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The guidance aligns with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), which requires that an EIR should discuss inconsistencies between the proposed project and the regional transportation plan. For the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) region, this consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

The General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment project and the future development projects are located within an area designated as an Established Community in both the 2016 and 2020 MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions through VMT reduction, and these efforts are primarily focused on urban areas, where investments in the roadway system and transit, bike and pedestrian infrastructure are built into the MTP/SCS to achieve identified air quality targets.

According to the MTP/SCS, Established Community areas are typically areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities. Many are characterized as “first tier”, “inner ring”, or mature subdivision communities. Local land use patterns aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. The MTP/SCS assumes that over the next two decades, the region will attract roughly 168,000 new homes and 228,000 new jobs to infill areas in cities, suburbs and towns across the region. This is about 64 percent of new housing and 84 percent of the new jobs expected in the region by 2040.

Figures 3-10 and 3-11 of the 2020 MTP/SCS show the 2016 and the projected 2040 vehicle miles traveled per capita for the six-County SACOG region. The sub-region in which the project is located and a portion of the project site is shown as having in 2016 \leq 85-100% of the regional average VMT per capita, and in the future (2040) the sub-region in which the project is located and a portion of the project site is shown as having \leq 50-85% and \leq 85-100% of the regional average VMT per capita (the other portion of the project site has no data). The MTP/SCS anticipates some increased activity/growth within Established Communities. Additionally, these areas are recognized as typically having high VMT per capita both now and in the future (2040 MTP/SCS Planning Period). The introduction of additional multi-family housing at these locations instead would provide opportunities for individuals residing at this location to work in closer proximity to existing, surrounding, job generating land uses. If Areas A and B are developed with office or retail commercial uses, these uses could provide local job and shopping opportunities to existing Rocklin residents who are currently traveling outside of the local area to places of employment and for their shopping needs. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment would result in the generation of between 1,428 and 1,928 fewer Average Daily Trips (ADT) (a 20 - 27% reduction in trips per day) than what would be generated if the site were to be developed under the current land use designation and zoning, which is also presumed to have a corresponding reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

There is bus service available along Sunset Boulevard bus stops in the project vicinity, so the use of bus service by residents of the future development projects is anticipated. In addition, the project is located within one road mile of existing retail commercial services including a Grocery Outlet grocery store that could be utilized by residents of the future development projects. Collectively, these elements are anticipated to result in the reduction of the future development project's VMT as compared to if the project site were developed under the current land use and zoning designations and there would not be a conflict or inconsistency with the MTP/SCS.

Thus, it can be concluded that the potential increased activity/growth associated with the future development projects would not conflict with the MTP/SCS' strategy for reducing VMT and therefore the project's impact associated with VMT increases is considered less than significant.

c. and d. Hazards and Emergency Access – *Less than Significant Impact*. This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residential units and the resultant generation of vehicle trips. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact with regard to hazards and emergency access from the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of the uses described above at these three project areas would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units that would result in vehicle trips being generated, but a less than significant hazards and emergency access impact would be anticipated because the future development projects would be evaluated by the City's Engineering Services Manager to assess such items as hazards due to a design feature or

incompatible uses. In addition, the future development projects would be evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin's Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Through these reviews and any required changes, a less than significant hazard or emergency access impact is anticipated.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residences.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities which could potentially impact cultural resources.

Although a cultural resources report was not prepared at this time, the project sites are largely vacant, have been previously graded and/or are not known to not contain any resources that are listed with the California Register of Historical Resources, on a locally designated list, or that have been determined by the lead agency to have significance to a California Native American Tribe. Input received from consultation with the United Auburn Indian Community, described further on the following page, also resulted in the conclusion that a previously recorded site on a portion of Area A has likely already been disturbed and does not require further evaluation. Therefore, a less than significant impact to tribal cultural resources is anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development projects. These serve as uniformly applied development

policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

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

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section (Public Resources Code Section 21080.1 (d))

As of the writing of this document, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), the Lone Band of Miwok Indians (IBMI), the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (SSBMI) and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (TMDCI) are the only tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area that have requested notification. Consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 (d) and per AB-52, the City of Rocklin provided formal notification of the project and the opportunity to consult on it to the designated contacts of the UAIC, IBMI, SSBMI and TMDCI in a letter received by those organizations on 12/09/2021, 12/10/2021, 12/13/2021 and 12/14/2021, respectively. The IBMI, TMDCI, and SSBMI had 30 days to request consultation on the project pursuant to AB-52 and they did not respond at all or prior to the end of their 30-day periods. The UAIC had until January 8, 2022, the end of the 30-day period, and responded on January 14th 2022 stating that there is a cultural site recorded within Area A. Any ground disturbing activity at this location would need to have tribal consultation and specific mitigation measures to protect the site. Through email correspondence, City staff informed the UAIC that there is no application for development of the property at this time. Further, this area had been totally graded and a pad had been constructed on this site as part of a previous development project. Therefore, the UAIC agreed that no further consultation on this site is required as part of the proposed project. In addition, any future development of the project site will require additional review from the City of Rocklin, including an evaluation of potential tribal cultural resource impacts through AB-52 consultation and an analysis of whether additional review under CEQA would be required beyond this document. Therefore, impacts to tribal cultural resources are considered to be less than significant.

| XIX. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X | | |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | | | X | | |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | X | | |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | | | X | | |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residences. Therefore, there will be a less than significant utilities and service systems impact with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential units which would be expected to create a need for the provision of utilities and service systems, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the utility and service providers to adequately provide such services.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. and c. Relocation, New or Expanded Utilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is located within the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) service area for sewer. SPMUD would be anticipated to provide a letter regarding a future multi-family residential development indicating that the project is within their service area and eligible for service, provided that their condition requirements and standard specifications are met. SPMUD has a System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan, which is periodically updated, to provide sewer to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary. SPMUD collects participation fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities. The proposed project is responsible for complying with all requirements of SPMUD,

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

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

The proposed project would be conditioned to require connection into the City's storm drain system, with Best Management Practices and/or Low Impact Development features located within the project's drainage system at a point prior to where the project site runoff will enter the City's storm drain system. Other than on-site improvements, new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required as a result of this project.

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

The project site is within the service area for AT&T, CCI Communications, Wave Broadband and various wireless service telecommunications providers. Infrastructure for telephone and cable

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

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

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

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

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

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

anticipated. Federal and State regulations regarding solid waste consist of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations and the California Integrated Waste Management Act regulating waste reduction. These regulations primarily affect local agencies and other agencies such as the Landfill Authority. The future development projects will comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations regarding trash and waste and other nuisance-related issues as may be applicable. Recology would provide garbage collection services to the project site, provided their access requirements are met.

The future development projects are not expected to include any unusual elements that would generate solid waste in excess of State and local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and the project would comply with solid waste regulations and the impact would be less than significant.

| XX. WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient |
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | X | | |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | | | X | | |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | | | X | | |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | | | X | | |

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

This project is only a request for a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment and it does not include a specific development proposal nor will it directly result in any construction or occupation of any residences. Therefore, there will be a less than significant wildfire impact with the proposed project at this time.

However, the future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential and retail commercial and office structures which would be expected to increase the need for fire and emergency responses to the project sites, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the fire and emergency responders to adequately provide such services.

There are no locations in Rocklin that are classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of wildland fires that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, impairment or interference with implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans and cumulative hazard impacts (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.7-20 through 4.7-28). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in wildland fire and emergency response impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to utilities and service systems.

These goals and policies include, but are not limited to, maintaining emergency operations plans, coordination with emergency management agencies, annexation into financing districts for fire prevention/suppression and emergency response, incorporation of fuel modification/fire hazard reduction planning, and maintaining interjurisdictional cooperation and coordination.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Impair Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan – *Less than Significant Impact.* The future development projects would occur on project sites that are contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project sites are not expected to include any features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The streets adjacent to the project sites serve as emergency evacuation corridors and would provide direct fire vehicle access to the site. In addition, the future development projects would be evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin's Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Most wildland fires are caused by human activities involving motor vehicles, construction/maintenance equipment, arson and burning of debris. The addition of impervious surface cover on the vacant project sites may in fact help reduce the potential fire risk. Therefore, the project will not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan and the impact will be less than significant.

b. and c. Exacerbation of Fire Risk – *Less than Significant Impact.* The future development projects would occur on project sites that are contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project sites does not occur in an area where an exacerbation of fire risk would occur due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The future development projects would be required to install new fire hydrants and the project will include underground power lines which will reduce the potential for overhead powerline fires. In addition, construction of roadway improvements and other impervious surface areas, as well as upgrades to existing infrastructure would help reduce fire risk. Therefore, the future development projects will not exacerbate wildfire risk and the impact will be less than significant.

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

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Degradation of Environment Quality – *Less than Significant Impact*. The proposed project sites have been previously graded and are mostly surrounded by developed land. Based on the project locations and the fact that the project does not propose any physical development,

the proposed project does not have the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts.

b. Cumulatively Considerable Impacts – *Less than Significant Impact.* Development in the South Placer region as a whole will contribute to regional air pollutant emissions, thereby delaying attainment of Federal and State air quality standards, regardless of development activity in the City of Rocklin and application of mitigation measures. As a result of this potential degradation of the quality of the environment, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. The future development of a multi-family residential complex on Area A, and additional multi-family residential complexes or retail commercial/office uses at Areas B and C would result in construction activities and the occupation of residential and potentially retail commercial and office units represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, but the proposed project represents less vehicle trip generation and associated air quality and greenhouse gas emission impacts than that which was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. In addition, the project-specific air quality analysis discussed above demonstrated that the future development projects would have a less than significant cumulative air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impact. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5. References

City of Rocklin General Plan, October 2012

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

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

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

City of Rocklin Design Review Guidelines

Raney Planning & Management, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Rocklin Rezone – Parcel 1 Project, February 2022

Raney Planning & Management, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Rocklin Rezone – Parcel 2 Project, February 2022

Raney Planning & Management, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Rocklin Rezone – Parcel 3 Project, February 2022

Attachments

Attachment A – Project Vicinity Map

NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

West Oaks RHNA Sites General Plan Amendment and Rezone/General Development Plan Amendment (GPA2021-0005, PDG2021-0004, PDG2021-0005, Z2021-0003, and Z2021-0004)

Project Name and Description

The Project is a City-initiated request for approval of a General Plan Amendment, two General Development Plan Amendments, and two Rezones to change the land use designations and zoning of eight parcels in the northwestern area of Rocklin to accommodate high density residential development, consistent with the recently certified City of Rocklin Housing Element 2021-2029. These modifications are required in order to comply with the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

The project is considered to be a "paper change" and would not result in any actual development or physical impacts on the environment. Future development would be subject to additional entitlements and review by the City of Rocklin. For more detail please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Project Location

There are three project areas, which are identified as follows:

- A) Six (6) parcels at westerly terminus of West Oaks Blvd; APNs 365-020-067, -068, -069, -070, -071, and -072. This area is located within the boundaries of the Sunset West General Development Plan.
- B) One (1) parcel at the northwest corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd., south of Atherton Road; APN 017-281-016. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.
- C) One (1) parcel at the northeast corner of Lonetree Blvd. and West Oaks Blvd.; APN 017-284-015. This area is located within the boundaries of the Stanford Ranch General Development Plan.

The applicant is the City of Rocklin. The property owner of Area A (365-020-067 through -072) is Black Iris Properties LLC. The property owner of Area B (017-281-016) is GTA Lonetree LLC. The property owner of Area C (017-284-015) is Rocklin Corporate Center LLC.

Basis for Negative Declaration Determination

The City of Rocklin finds that as originally submitted the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, a NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared. The Initial Study supporting the finding stated above is incorporated herein by this reference. This determination is based upon the criteria of the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 – Determining the Significance of the Environmental Effects Caused by a Project, Section 15065 –

Mandatory Findings of Significance, and Section 15070 – Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Date Circulated for Review: February 18, 2022

Date Adopted: _____

Signature: _____
David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Department Director

ATTACHMENT A – PROJECT VICINTY MAP

