RESOLUTION NO. PC-2022-

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Lonetree Apartments
(DL2021-0002 and DR2021-0015)

WHEREAS, the City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator prepared an Initial Study on the Lonetree Apartments project (the "Project") which identified potentially significant effects of the Project; and

WHEREAS, revisions to and/or conditions placed on the Project, were made or agreed to by the applicant before the mitigated negative declaration was released for public review, were determined by the environmental coordinator to avoid or reduce the potentially significant effects to a level that is clearly less than significant and that there was, therefore, no substantial evidence that the Project, as revised and conditioned, would have a significant effect on the environment; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Rocklin as follows:

Section 1. Based on the Initial Study, the revisions and conditions incorporated into the Project, the required mitigation measures, and information received during the public review process, the Planning Commission of the City of Rocklin finds that there is no substantial evidence that the Project, as revised and conditioned, may have a significant effect on the environment.

Section 2. The mitigated negative declaration reflects the independent judgment of the Planning Commission.

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

Section 4. The statements of overriding considerations adopted by the City Council when approving the City of Rocklin General Plan Update are hereby readopted for the purposes of this mitigated negative declaration and the significant identified impacts of this project related

to aesthetics, air quality, traffic circulation, noise, cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources, and climate change and greenhouse gases.

Section 5. A mitigated negative declaration of environmental impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared in connection with the Project, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference, are recommended for approval for the Project.

Section 6. The Project Initial Study is attached as Attachment 1 and is incorporated by reference. All other documents, studies, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission has based its decision are located in the office of the Rocklin Community Development Director, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677. The custodian of these documents and other materials is the Rocklin Community Development Director.

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

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of _____, 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners:

NOES: Commissioners:

ABSENT: Commissioners:

ABSTAIN: Commissioners:

_____
Gregg McKenzie, Chairperson

ATTEST:

_____
Terry Stemple, Secretary

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

ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Lonetree Apartments
DL2021-0002 and DR2021-0015

Northwest of the intersection of West Oaks Boulevard and West Lonetree Boulevard, south of Atherton Road, in the City of Rocklin
APN's 017-281-014 and 017-281-015

April 15, 2022

***PREPARED BY*:**

Nathan Anderson, Senior Planner, (916) 625-5114

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 property owner is GTA Lonetree, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company.
The applicant is Mark Tekin.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

This Initial Study (IS) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Rocklin CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the 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:
Lonetree Apartments

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:
The project site is located northwest of the intersection of West Oaks Boulevard and Lonetree Boulevard and south of Atherton Road, in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 017-281-014 and -015.

Project Sponsor's Name:
The property owner is GTA Lonetree, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. The applicant is Mark Tekin.

Current General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Proposed General Plan Designation: No change requested

Current Zoning: Planned Development Residential, 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-24+)

Proposed Zoning: No change requested

Description of the Project:
The project is a request for approval of a Design Review to construct a 237-unit multifamily residential community on 9.7 +/- net acres and a Tentative Parcel Map to remove a "No Vehicular Access" easement on West Oaks Boulevard and to merge the two parcels into a single parcel. The Project would include parking and landscaping as well as indoor and outdoor amenities such as a clubhouse, children's play area, and swimming pool. For more detail, please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
The project site is located to the south of Atherton Road, north of West Oaks Boulevard, west of Lonetree Boulevard, and east of State Route 65. To the north of the project site is land designated as Recreation/Conservation and existing businesses within the Atherton Tech Center Business

Park. The Atherton Tech Center Business Park is also located directly to the west, with State Route 65 located beyond. To the east of the project site is a vacant parcel designated for Light Industrial land uses, with office complexes located beyond, as well as a church facility and Kathy Lund Park. To the south of the project site is West Oaks Boulevard, with High Density Residential land uses including the James Apartment and Arroyo Vista communities 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/waste discharge requirements
- 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":

	Aesthetics		Agriculture/Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Energy
	Geology/Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materi
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population/Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities/Service Systems		Wildfire		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	None	**X**	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.

April 15, 2022

David Mohlenbrok — Date

Community Development Department Director

SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The project site is comprised of two undeveloped parcels located northwest of the intersection of West Oaks Boulevard and Lonetree Boulevard and south of Atherton Road within the City of Rocklin. The site is located approximately 875 feet to the east of State Route (SR) 65 and is adjacent to multi-family residences to the south, undeveloped land to the east, and commercial and industrial businesses to the north, and northwest. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 017-281-014 and 017-281-015 (Please see Attachment A, Vicinity Map).

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

B. Description

The project is a request for approval of a Design Review to construct a multifamily residential community on 9.7 acres and a Tentative Parcel Map to remove a "No Vehicular Access" easement on West Oaks Boulevard and to merge the two parcels into a single parcel. The proposed project is an apartment community with 237 total units, indoor and outdoor amenities, parking, and landscaping. A mix of one, two, and three-bedroom units are organized into eleven three-story buildings arranged around the site. A clubhouse, pool, and other outdoor amenities are interior to the site and screened from adjacent roadways by apartment buildings located on the site's perimeter. The total building area is 129,047 square feet (sf), total landscaping is 115,579 sf and total paving is 209,742 sf.

The project would be fenced and gated. The main vehicular access to the project will be on West Oaks Boulevard at the southeast corner of the project site, approximately 375 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard. This main vehicular access would include gated access and would be located opposite the existing driveway to the James Apartment complex on the south side of West Oaks Boulevard.

A secondary gated access point is provided via a driveway entrance on Atherton Road at the northeast corner of the project site, approximately 675 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard and 825 feet east of Menlo Drive. Drive aisles (25-foot width) will provide internal access throughout the site. Accessible pedestrian paths are planned around the buildings to provide a walking route for residents. Public sidewalks would be installed along the project frontage on West Oaks Boulevard, consistent with City standards. The existing class II bike lanes on both roadways would be maintained.

The southern portion of the property contains a "No Vehicular Access" easement, which was recorded with the original Tentative Subdivision Map. This property was originally zoned and designated for industrial use, thereby creating an incompatibility with the existing high-density residential development to the south. Because the General Plan designation and zoning was changed to allow high density residential in 2020, this incompatibility no longer exists and the easement is being removed.

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, and the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Area EIR, which are 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 and Northwest Rocklin Annexation Area 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:

The development of a 237-unit multifamily residential community on 9.7 acres would change the existing visual nature / character of the project site and area. The development of the project site would create new sources of light and glare typical of urban development. As discussed below, impacts to scenic vistas or viewsheds would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Scenic Vista - *No Impact*. While vacant or mostly vacant areas have a natural aesthetic quality, there are no designated scenic vistas within the City of Rocklin or Planning Area. Alteration of the vacant and undeveloped project site through the construction of a 237-unit multifamily community 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 development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site

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.* The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would result in the construction of structures which 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. The 237-unit multi-family residential complex would 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 West Oaks Townhomes and other surrounding vacant properties; there are no unusual development characteristics of this proposed project or the future development of a multi-family residential complex 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 multi-family residential 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 the proposed project.

All development in the Rocklin Planning Area is subject to existing City development standards set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance and the City's Design Review Guidelines which help to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community. The proposed project at this project site would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Also applicable to this Project is the University District Architectural Guidelines which are meant to inspire and provide designers with basic direction in developing projects that focus on high quality design and use of materials and require review by the City's Architectural Review Committee.

The 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 at this site does not result in a change to the finding because the site would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development.

d. Light and Glare – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex 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. New and/or increased sources of light and glare would be introduced to the project area. However, implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the General Plan policies addressing light and glare would also ensure that no unusual daytime glare or nighttime lighting is produced. These guidelines and policies would require the following: 1) all exterior lighting is to be designed and installed to avoid adverse glare on adjacent properties and to incorporate "dark sky" provisions; 2) Cut-off decorative light fixtures, or equivalent, shall be used for parking lot and building mounted lighting and mounted such that all light is projected directly toward the ground; 3) the lighting shall be reviewed and revised if needed to avoid "hot spots" under parking lot lights and to eliminate light spill over the property lines that exceeds 0.1 foot candles, and 4) light poles shall be a maximum of 20 feet in height as measured from grade to the top of the light fixture itself. 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 would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

	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. 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 site as grazing land. This category is not considered Important Farmland under the definition in CEQA of "Agricultural Land" that is afforded consideration as to its potential significance (see CEQA Section 21060.1[a]), nor is it considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance; therefore, the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Also, the project site contains no parcels that are under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, because the project would not convert important farmland to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing agricultural or forestry use zoning or Williamson Act contracts, or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses, there would be no agricultural use impacts.

c. and d. Rezone or Conversion of Timberland, Forest Land– No Impact. The project site contains no parcels that are considered forestry lands or timberland. Therefore, because the project would not conflict with existing forestry use zoning or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, there would be no forestry use impacts.

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:

In the short-term, air quality impacts from the proposed project will result from construction related activities associated with grading and excavation to prepare the site for the installation of utilities and above ground structures and improvements. These air quality impacts will primarily be related to the generation of airborne dust (Particulate Matter of 10 microns in size or less (PM_{10})).

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

As discussed below, a 237-unit multifamily residential development of this type 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 project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

As part of the General Plan Amendment and Rezone of the project site from Light Industrial to High Density Residential in 2021, the firm of Raney Planning & Management, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis report for a theoretical multi-family residential complex project consisting of 274-units, a 15,000 square foot clubhouse and resident parking spaces. The report, dated September 2020, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that 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.

While Raney's 2020 report analyzed a multifamily housing project with a slightly higher density than the proposed project (274 units were analyzed as part of the report versus the 237-unit project which is currently proposed), its results are considered conservative and can still be utilized to evaluate potential impacts of the Project.

In addition, an updated Air Quality/GHG report was prepared by Marc Papineau (with the firm of Environmental Service) for the project, dated July 14, 2021. The report is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Environmental Service 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 Environmental Service report, which is summarized below. This report provided a comparison of the air quality and greenhouse gas emission modeling results for the 2020 Raney Planning and Management report with the modeling results based on the revised project specifics, and the project-specific results are used in the tables below.

The analysis was prepared to estimate the criteria pollutant emissions from project construction and operation. The short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of the development of a 237-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.)

Construction Emissions

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

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including, but not limited to, the following, which would be noted with City-approved construction plans:

- Rule 202 related to visible emissions; Rule 217 related to asphalt paving materials; Rule 218 related to architectural coatings; Rule 228 related to fugitive dust, and Regulation 3 related to open burning.

The analysis found that the overall project's maximum daily emissions from construction operations would be as follows:

MAXIMUM UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (lbs/day)			
	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	**Nitrous Oxides (NOx)**	**Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})**
Maximum Daily Emissions	21.3	33.1	19.8
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	82	82	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

As shown, the project's short-term construction-related emissions are not anticipated to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM_{10}. Therefore, construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone and $PM_{10.}$ Accordingly, construction of the proposed project would not violate any ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions of ROG, NOx and PM_{10} would be generated by the project from both mobile and stationary sources. Day-to-day activities such as vehicle trips to and from the project site would make up the majority of the mobile emissions. Emissions would occur from stationary sources such as natural gas combustion from heating mechanisms, landscape maintenance equipment exhaust, and consumer products (e.g., deodorants, cleaning products, spray paint, etc.). The modeling performed for the project takes these factors into consideration.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, such as those listed previously for construction, as well as the following for operations:

- Rule 225 related to wood-burning appliances, and Rule 246 related to water heaters.

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

MAXIMUM UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day)			
	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	**Nitrous Oxides (NOx)**	**Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})**
Maximum Daily Emissions	10.2	19.1	10.2
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	55	55	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

As shown, the project's operational emissions of ROG, NOx and PM_{10} would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the project's operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and operationally-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Air Quality

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

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

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS, and thus result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM_{10} are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM_{10} emissions would be 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, NOx and PM_{10} emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds; therefore, impacts related to the cumulative emissions of criteria pollutants for which the PCAPCD area is in non-attainment would be considered less than significant.

The General Plan EIR identified a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact. The proposed development of a 237-unit multi-family residential project would not result in a change to this finding because the project does 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.* The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site 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 (PM_{10}) standards, as well as for both the federal and State ozone standards. The federal Clean Air Act requires areas designated as federal nonattainment to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures for states to use to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. In compliance with regulations, the PCAPCD periodically prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions via regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 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 Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the

United States Environmental Protection Agency (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 PM_{10}, 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
NOx	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 development of a 237-unit multi-family residential project's construction and operational emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. These thresholds consider strategies for attaining air quality standards. Accordingly, the project's construction and operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and construction-related and operationally-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

For cumulative emissions, the PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions and the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM_{10} emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's operational-level thresholds, the project could be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans, and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. As shown in the Operational Emissions table above, the development of a 237-unit multi-family residential project would result in the generation of ROG, NOx and PM_{10} emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds. Thus, the development project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard and the impact would be considered less than significant.

c. Sensitive Receptors – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site 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. The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site involves the development of residential uses; thus, the project would introduce sensitive receptors to the area. The nearest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are the multi-family residences across West Oaks Boulevard, located approximately 100 feet south of the project site, as well as the Seavy Center School and the Western Sierra Collegiate Academy located approximately 100 feet and 400 feet northwest of the project site, respectively.

Emissions of carbon monoxide (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.

Localized concentrations of CO are related to the levels of traffic and congestion along streets and at intersections. Traffic congestion near a roadway's intersection with vehicles moving slowly or idling could result in localized CO emissions at that intersection due to a vehicle engine's inefficient combustion. High levels of localized CO concentrations are only expected where background levels are high. Accordingly, a land use project could result in impacts associated with localized CO concentrations at roadway intersections if the project generates substantial traffic. Typically, according to the statewide CO Protocol document, signalized intersections operating at Level of Service (LOS) E or F, or projects that would result in the worsening of signalized intersections to LOS E or F, have the potential to result in localized CO concentrations in excess of the State or federal AAQS and potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations.

In accordance with the statewide CO Protocol, 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 level of service (LOS) on one or more streets at one or more intersections (both signalized and non-signalized) in the project vicinity from an acceptable peak-hour Level of Service (LOS) (e.g., LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable peak-hour LOS (e.g., LOS E or F); or
- 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 (it should be noted that for purposes of CO analysis the threshold of significance is worse than LOS D, however for purposes of traffic analysis the City's LOS threshold for acceptable operations is LOS C).

According to the air quality modeling performed in Raney's 2020 report for the development of a 274-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site (the results of which are considered to be conservative because the proposed project is now 237 units), operation of the

project would result in maximum mobile source CO emissions of 131.27 lbs/day. Consequently, CO emissions related to operation of the project would be far below the 550 lbs/day screening threshold used by PCAPCD. Therefore, according to the PCAPCD's screening methodology for localized CO emissions, the project would not be expected to generate substantial concentrations of localized CO emissions.

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 900 feet west of the site at the closest point. Thus, the project would not be subject to substantial DPM emissions associated with freeway traffic and risk levels from SR-65 would not expose new receptors to substantial health risk.

Due to the nature of the project, relatively few vehicle trips associated with the project would be expected to be composed of heavy-duty diesel-fueled trucks and their associated emissions. The project would not involve any land uses or operations that would be considered major sources of TACs, including DPM, and the project does not involve long-term operation of any stationary diesel engine or other on-site stationary source of TACs. As such, the proposed project would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations.

Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically DPM, from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. However, construction is temporary and occurs over a relatively short duration in comparison to the operational lifetime of 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, as noted above 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 project 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 project 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, the proposed 237-unit multifamily residential project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Diesel fumes associated with diesel-fueled equipment and heavy-duty trucks, such as from construction activities or operations of emergency generators, could be found to be objectionable. However, as addressed above, construction is temporary and construction

equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and would likely only occur over portions of the project area at a time.

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

Because the proposed project does not include the development of odor-generating land uses or development in proximity to odor-generating land uses, because the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of passenger vehicles rather than heavy-duty diesel trucks, and considering the intermittent nature and short-term duration of construction activities, the project would not be anticipated to result in the exposure of residences or other sensitive receptors to objectionable odors or result in other emissions such as those leading to the creation of objectionable odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES **Would the project:**		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:

The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would 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. The project does not contain any oak trees, but based upon biological surveys, the project site includes a creek, associated riparian areas, seasonal wetlands and 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 project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Olberding Environmental, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in biological resources, prepared a Biological Resources Analysis Report for an approximately 18-acre total project site which includes the vacant 6.4+/- and 5.1 +/-acre sites that comprise the project site, as well as a 6.5 +/- acre site located directly east of the proposed project (the 6.5 +/- acre site is not a part of the proposed project). The report, dated February 2022, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Olberding Environmental, 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 Olberding Environmental, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

Project Site Description:

The property encompasses approximately 18.3 acres in a roughly oval shape bounded on the north by Atherton Road, on the east by Lonetree Boulevard, the south by West Oaks Boulevard and the west by the Atherton Tech Center. The property supports three habitat types consisting of annual grassland, seasonal wetland/vernal pool, and perennial drainage. The single perennial drainage occurs along the western boundary of the property, and a series of seasonal wetlands and vernal pools are scattered across the property and interspersed with annual grassland habitat. On the overall 18.3 acres, the aquatic resource delineation determined that there were approximately 0.42 acre of creek, 0.10 acre of seasonal wetland, and 0.90 acre of vernal pool.

The topography of the property consists of mostly flat land that ranges between 119 feet above sea level within the drainage near the northwestern corner and 135 feet above sea level along the southeastern boundary.

Biological Assessment Overview

As part of the assessment of the project site's biological resources, queries of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (including the Rocklin USGS quadrangle which includes the project area and the eight other surrounding quadrangles including Roseville, Lincoln, Sheridan, Gold Hill, Folsom, Citrus Heights, Rio Linda and Pleasant Grove), United States Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) species lists, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soils survey, California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory and other literature reviews were conducted to provide updated information on special-status plant and wildlife species within the project region. A biological site visit was made on December 18, 2020 to determine: 1) plant communities present in the study area; 2) if existing conditions provided suitable habitat for any special-status plant or wildlife species, and 3) if sensitive habitats are present. Existing biological resources of the project site are summarized

below, focusing on the potential for occurrence of special-status species and other sensitive resources.

Biological Communities

Three biological communities were identified on the project site: annual grassland, perennial drainage (creek) and seasonal wetland/vernal pool. Vegetative cover is generally dominated by 16.7 +/- acres of non-native annual grassland habitat, followed by 1.0 +/- acre of seasonal wetland/vernal pool and 0.4 acre of perennial drainage (creek).

Special-Status Plant and Animal Species

Special-status plant and animal species are those that have been afforded special recognition by federal, State, or local resources or organizations. Listed and special-status species are of relatively limited distribution and may require specialized habitat conditions.

Plants

Based on a review of the resource databases noted above and the specific habitat characteristics and soil types of the project site, there are five potentially occurring special-status plant species: Dwarf downingia, Legenere, Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop, Sacramento Valley Orcutt grass and Pincushion navarretia. Suitable habitat for these species occurs within the grassland and vernal pool/wetland habitat. Two rare plant surveys were conducted in 2021, one on April 15 and one on July 20, and no rare plants were observed. No additional plant surveys are warranted unless one year's time has elapsed.

Wildlife

Based upon a review of resource databases noted above, there are twelve potentially occurring special-status animal species on the project site. These species are discussed in more detail below:

Special-Status Invertebrates – Three invertebrate species, California linderiella, vernal pool tadpole shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp, have been identified as having a high potential to occur on the project site. Multiple CNDDB occurrences and USFWS designated critical habitat of vernal pool fairy shrimp are recorded in the vicinity of the project site. The project site contains suitable habitat in the seasonal wetlands and complex of vernal pool features. A survey was conducted in April 2021, and no special-status invertebrate species were observed. However, due to time constraints associated with protocol level surveys, presence of special-status invertebrates has been assumed and mitigation will be purchased at an appropriate mitigation bank.

Foraging or Nesting Raptor/Passerine Species – A total of seven bird species were identified as having the potential to occur on the project site. Five species, including red-shouldered hawk,

red-tailed hawk, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and Cooper's hawk had a high potential to occur in a foraging capacity only. The burrowing owl and tri-colored blackbird have a moderate potential to occur in a breeding and/or foraging capacity,

Special-Status Mammals – No sign of bat use was observed on the project site; it was determined that bats have a low potential to utilize this site due to limited habitat suitability. No suitable trees or structures exist within the project site and are presumed absent from the project site.

Special-Status Amphibians – One amphibian species, Western spadefoot toad, has been identified as having a moderate to high potential to occur on the project site. Multiple CNDDB occurrences are recorded in the vicinity of the project site. The project site contains suitable breeding habitat in the seasonal wetlands, drainages and vernal pool features and ground squirrel burrows suitable for upland refuge. For these reasons, the spadefoot has a moderate potential to occur in a breeding, foraging and upland capacity,

Special-Status Reptiles – The western pond turtle was identified by the CNDDB as occurring in the vicinity of the project site. An assessment of the project site concluded that the site provides suitable habitat for the western pond turtle and has a moderate potential to occur on the project site.

C. Hydrology and Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.

The project site contains wetlands/waters that may be considered jurisdictional by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The project site has a perennial drainage and a series of seasonal wetlands and vernal pools. These areas showed positive indicators of wetland soils, hydrology and vegetation. If any project-related activities are to occur within these features, an Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional delineation would be required.

D. Riparian Vegetation

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) asserts jurisdiction over riparian habitat under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. The boundary of the creek and riparian area have been verified by the City and by a biologist from Olberding Environmental, Inc. and this area plus a 50-foot buffer will be set aside as open space (consistent with City policy), and no construction or development will be allowed within the boundary of this area. Therefore, no impacts to this area are anticipated, and a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW is not expected to be required.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Effect on Protected Species – *Less Than Significant With Mitigation*. The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would result in the construction and

operational activities that would directly result in physical disturbance of the project site and its biological resources.

Special-Status Plants

As noted above, five special-status plant species, Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop, dwarf downingia, legenere, pincushion navarretia, and Sacramento Orcutt grass were determined to have the potential to occur on the project site. Two rare plant surveys were conducted in 2021, one on April 15, and one on July 20, and no rare plants were observed. No additional plant surveys are warranted unless one year's time has elapsed.

To address the project's potential impacts to special-status plants, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-1 *Prior to any grading or construction activities, pre-construction protocol-level surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the portions of the project site planned for development, in order to identify the presence of any of the following special-status plant species: Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop (Gratiola heterosepala),* Dwarf Downingia *(Downingia pusilla),* Lengenere *(Legenere limosa),* Pincushion Navarretia *(Navarretia myersii ssp. Myersii),* Sacramento Orcutt Grass *(Orcuttis viscidia), . Pre-construction protocol-level surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period (March-October) for all plant species to adequately ensure recognition of potentially-occurring species. Because the blooming period of all potentially-occurring plant species covers a wide range, a minimum of three focused rare plant surveys timed approximately one month apart are recommended from April through June to cover the peak blooming period. The results of the surveys shall be submitted to California Department of Fish & Game and the City of Rocklin for review.*

If, as a result of the survey(s), special-status plant species are determined not to occur on the sites, further action shall not be required. If special-status plant species are detected on either site, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped with GPS and consultation with California Department of Fish & Game shall be initiated, and a mitigation plan shall be prepared based on the consultation. The plan shall detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure no net loss of plant species.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to special-status plant species to a less than significant level.

Special-Status Invertebrates

As noted above, three invertebrate species, California linderiella, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and vernal pool fairy shrimp, have been identified as having a high potential to occur on the project site. A pre-construction survey was conducted in April 2021, and no special status invertebrate species were observed. However, due to time constraints associated with protocol level surveys, presence of special status invertebrates has been assumed. Mitigation for this will be addressed as part of the 404 permit requirement included as Mitigation Measure IV.-7.

Foraging or Nesting Raptor/Passerine Species

As noted above, a total of seven bird species were identified as having the potential to occur on the Property. Five species including red-shouldered hawk, red-tailed hawk, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and Cooper's hawk had a high potential to occur in a foraging capacity only. The burrowing owl and tri-colored blackbird have a moderate potential to occur in a breeding and/or foraging capacity.

To address the project's potential impacts to foraging or nesting raptor/passerine species, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-2 The applicant/developer shall attempt to time the removal of potential nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds to avoid the nesting season (February 1 through September 15).

If tree and vegetation removal and/or project grading or construction activities would occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February-September 15), the developer and/or contractor shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of tree and vegetation removal activities. The survey shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be valid for one construction season. Prior to the start of tree and vegetation removal activities, documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City of Rocklin Engineering Department and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary tree and vegetation removal may proceed. If there is a break in construction activities of more than 14 days, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

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

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (September 16 – January 31), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to foraging or nesting raptor/passerine species to a less than significant level.

To address the potential impact of the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-3 If an active Swainson's hawk nest tree is located within 1,000 feet of the project site, prior to the start of grading or construction activity, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by providing 0.5 acre of replacement Swainson's hawk habitat land for each acre of land to be developed. The mitigation may be in the form of mitigation bank credits, conservation easements or fee title to an appropriate entity. The location of the habitat area is encouraged, but not required to be within Placer County. Habitats located within the north half of the Central Valley, from the Stanislaus River to Redding shall be deemed acceptable. The applicant shall verify that this condition has been met to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk to a less than significant level.

As noted above, burrowing owls were not identified on the property during the December 2020 survey. However, because potential burrowing owl habitat is present onsite, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-4 Prior to any grading activities, the applicant/developer shall hire a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction take avoidance survey between 14 and 30 days prior to the commencement of construction, in accordance with the 2012 California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012 Staff Report) (CDFW 2012). The survey area shall include an approximately 500-foot buffer area around the footprint of work activities, where access is permitted. If the surveys are negative, then and a letter report documenting the results of the survey should be provided to the CDFW, City of Rocklin Environmental Services Division and the project proponent for their records, and no additional measures are required. If construction does not commence within 14

days of the pre-construction survey, or halts for more than 14 days, a new survey shall be required.

If burrows are observed within 500 feet of the footprint of work activities, an impact assessment shall be prepared and submitted to the CDFW, in accordance with the 2012 Staff Report. If it is determined that project activities may result in impacts to nesting, occupied, and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat, the biologist shall consult with CDFW and develop a detailed mitigation plan such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows, and burrowing owls impacted are replaced. The mitigation plan shall be implemented prior to any grading activities and/or prior to the issuance of Improvement Plans.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to burrowing owls to a less than significant level.

Special-Status Amphibians and Reptiles

As noted above, one amphibian species, Western spadefoot toad, has been identified as having a moderate to high potential to occur on the Property. Multiple CNDDB occurrences are recorded in the vicinity of the Property. The Property contains suitable breeding habitat in the seasonal wetlands, drainages and vernal pool features and ground squirrel burrows suitable for upland refuge. For these reasons the spadefoot has a moderate potential to occur in a breeding, foraging and upland capacity.

The western pond turtle was identified by the CNDDB as occurring in the vicinity of the Property. An assessment of the Property concluded that the site provides suitable habitat for the western pond turtle and has a moderate potential to occur on the Property. While potential occurrence of western pond turtle is limited to the adjacent, non-impacted creek channel, dispersal through the Property could potentially occur.

To address the project's potential impacts to special-status amphibians and/or reptiles, the following mitigation measures, agreed to by the applicant, are being applied to the project:

IV.-5 A pre-construction survey for western pond turtle should be conducted within 14 days of the initiation of construction by a qualified biologist prior to any construction activity that would directly impact pond or stream habitat or disturb the ground within 300 feet of aquatic habitat. If no western pond turtles are observed, a letter report should be prepared to document the survey and shall be provided to the City of Rocklin, and no additional measures are recommended. If construction does not commence within 14 days of the

pre-construction survey or halts for more than 14 days a new survey should be conducted prior to reinitiating construction.

If western pond turtles are found during the pre-construction survey, then a qualified biological monitor should be onsite during initial clearing and grading within 300 feet of a drainage, pond, or other aquatic habitat. The biological monitor will relocate any western pond turtles found within the construction footprint to suitable habitat away from the construction zone, but within the vicinity of the project site, if required. In addition, a pre-construction worker awareness training should be conducted alerting workers to the presence of and protections for the western pond turtle. Evidence of the pre-construction worker awareness training shall be provided to the City prior to any ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to special-status amphibian and reptile species to a less than significant level.

IV.-6 *Prior to any grading or construction activities, but no longer than 28 days before, a pre-construction protocol-level survey for western spadefoot toad shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, to determine presence or absence of this species on the project sites. The survey shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable California Department of Fish & Wildlife guidelines. If western spadefoot toads are not found within the project site, no further mitigation is required. If juvenile or adult spadefoot toads are found within the proposed construction area, the individuals shall be moved out of the construction site with technical assistance from California Department of Fish & Wildlife. If spadefoot toad eggs are found within the construction area, construction shall not take place within 30 meters (100 feet) of the nest until the toads have hatched. (ENGINEERING, PLANNING)*

If a spadefoot toad is observed on the site, work shall cease in the area until the frog can be moved to a safe location consistent with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regulations. The survey shall be valid for 28 days; if construction does not start within 28 days of the survey, or if construction activities stop for more than 28 days, a new survey shall be conducted.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to special-status amphibian and reptile species to a less than significant level.

b. and c. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands – *Less Than Significant with Mitigation.*

The biological resource analysis survey conducted by Olberding Environmental indicates that the project site contains wetlands/waters that may be considered jurisdictional by the Army Corps of Engineers, RWQCB or CDFW. The project site has perennial drainage, and a series of seasonal wetlands and vernal pools (0.42 acre of creek, 0.10 acre of seasonal wetland, and 0.9 acre of vernal pool). These areas showed positive indicators of wetland soils, hydrology, and vegetation. If any project related activities are to occur within these features, an Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional delineation would be required.

Jurisdictional wetlands and waters potentially regulated under the authority of the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW are present on the project site. Fill of these regulated features may require authorization under Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and authorization under Section 1600 of the Fish and Wildlife Code.

A Corps wetland delineation should be prepared to document the actual extent of jurisdictional features if any construction activity could result in impacts to wetlands/waters. If the wetlands/waters are deemed jurisdictional and construction activities are proposed that could impact these features, permits must be obtained prior to construction. Setbacks from the wetlands/water features may be required to protect habitat quality and to protect water quality. Permitting to allow impacts to wetlands/waters features may also require mitigation.

To address the project's potential impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-7 Prior to any grading or construction activities, the appropriate Section 404 permit will need to be acquired for any project-related impacts to waters of the U.S. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed should be replaced or rehabilitated on a "no-net-loss" basis in accordance with the Corps' mitigation guidelines. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement should be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. In association with the Section 404 permit and prior to the issuance of improvement plans, a Section 401 water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a USFWS Biological Opinion shall be obtained. All terms and conditions of said permits shall be complied with.

Prior to any grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation to the Engineering Department that they have obtained an Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, a Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 water quality certification, and a United States Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion. The applicant shall also demonstrate to the Engineering Department that they have

implemented habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement as stipulated in their Section 404 permit. The applicant shall also demonstrate to the Engineering Department how they have, or intend to, comply with the terms and conditions of the Section 404 permit, the Section 401 water quality certification, and the Biological Opinion.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to waters of the U.S. and riparian habitat to a less than significant level.

d. Fish and Wildlife Movement – *Less than Significant Impact.*

Wildlife corridors link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. The fragmentation of undeveloped land by urbanization creates isolated "islands" of wildlife habitat. Fragmentation can also occur when a portion of one or more habitats is converted into another habitat, such as when woodland or scrub habitat is altered or converted into grasslands after a disturbance such as fire, mudslide, or grading activities. Wildlife corridors mitigate the effects of this fragmentation by: (1) allowing animals to move between remaining habitats, thereby permitting depleted populations to be replenished and promoting genetic exchange and diversity; (2) providing escape routes from fire, predators, and human disturbances, thus reducing the risk of catastrophic events (such as fire or disease) on population or local species extinction, and (3), serving as a travel routes for individual animals as they move within their home ranges in search of food, water, mates and other needs.

The project site consists of vacant properties and the surrounding lands are designated as Recreation/Conservation and then existing businesses within the Atherton Tech Center Business Park to the north of the project site. The Atherton Tech Center Business Park is also located directly to the west and to the west beyond that is State Route 65. To the east of the project site is a vacant parcel designated for Light Industrial land uses. Beyond that to the east is another vacant parcel designated for Light Industrial land uses, some office complexes, Kathy Lund Park and the site of the recently approved, but not yet completed, West Oaks Townhomes Subdivision which consists of 16 luxury small lot single family homes. To the south of the project site is West Oaks Boulevard, some land designated as Recreation/Conservation and some High-Density Residential land uses including the James Apartment and the Arroyo Vista communities.

The project site is located within a mostly developed area that includes roads, existing residential, light industrial and office developments, but the project site does include a creek and riparian habitat. As noted above, a portion of the project site includes a creek and the application of City policies will result in the establishment of a riparian buffer along the creek. To the degree that the creek and riparian area currently serve as a wildlife migration corridor, it is expected that the project's preservation of the creek and riparian area will also preserve the ability for wildlife to

use that corridor for movement. Therefore, the multi-family residential development is not anticipated to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites.

e. Local Policies/Ordinances – *No Impact.*

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.

Although an arborist report was not submitted in association with the proposed project, based upon reviews of aerial photos and site visits, there are no native oak trees within the boundaries of the project site that would be regulated by the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

There are no facts or circumstances presented by the proposed project which create conflicts with other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f. Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan – *No Impact.*

The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan because the site is not subject to any such plan; therefore, there is no impact related to a conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES **Would the project:**		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:

The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site 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 project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Peak & Associates, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in cultural resources, prepared a cultural resource report for the Lonetree Apartments project. The report, dated July 28, 2021, is not available for public review due to the need to protect the confidentiality of Native American cultural place information in compliance with federal and State rules and regulations. The report's basic findings are incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Peak & Associates, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes their conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Peak & Associates, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

In summary, the Peak & Associates, Inc. report included records searches of the North Central Information Center (NCIC), archival research, field parcel surveys and limited excavation efforts performed by a qualified archaeologist, a request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a search of the Sacred Lands File Inventory, and notification of Native American contacts recommended by the NAHC. The records searches revealed that the project area contains no prehistoric or historic period resources and there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic period artifacts, or evidence of previous habitation within the project area. However, the project site may contain unknown cultural resources that could potentially be discovered during construction activities.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Historic Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.* CEQA Statutes Section 21084.1 identifies historic resources as those listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, based on a range of criteria, including association with events or patterns of events that have made significant contributions to broad patterns of historical development in the United States or California, including local, regional, or specific cultural patterns (California Register Criterion 1), structures which are directly associated with important persons in the

history of the state or country (Criterion 2), which embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period, or other aesthetic importance (Criterion 3), or which have the potential to reveal important information about the prehistory or history of the state or the nation (such as archaeological sites) (Criterion 4).

In addition to meeting at least one of the above criteria, the structure must typically be over 50 years old (a state guideline rather than a statutory requirement) and have retained historic integrity sufficient to be clearly evident as a historic resource through a combination of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association with historic patterns. The definition of "integrity" in this context is based on criteria established by the National Register of Historic Places.

The project site is not known to contain any historic resources as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines (the project archaeologist concluded that there are no identified cultural resources on the project site that are considered eligible for the National or State Register of Historic Places/Resources); therefore, no impacts to historic resources are anticipated.

b. Archaeological Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.* While no archaeological resources were found during the Peak & Associates, Inc. study, as noted above, the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered cultural resources.

To address the project's potential impact of the discovery of unknown cultural resources, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

V.-1 If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) or tribal cultural resources is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or a tribal cultural resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources would include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts and tribal cultural resources.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e) (1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City's Environmental Services Manager shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to known and unknown/ undiscovered cultural resources to a less than significant level.

c. Human Remains – *Less Than Significant Impact.* No evidence of human remains is known to exist at the project site. However, in the event that during construction activities, human remains of Native American origin are discovered on the site during project demolition, it would be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall under the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resources Code Section 5097). In addition, State law (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5) requires that the Mitigation Measure V.-1 be implemented should human remains be discovered; implementation of Mitigation Measure V.-1 will reduce impacts regarding the discovery of human remains to a less than significant level.

VI. ENERGY Would the project:	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:

The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would 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 project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The development of a multi-family residential project at this project site would 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.

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

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

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

For the above reasons, the project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the project. The project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Rocklin, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Although improvements to City's pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems would provide further opportunities for alternative transit, the project would be linked closely with existing networks that, in large part, are sufficient for most residents or employees of the project and the City of Rocklin as a whole. For these reasons, and others (as described previously), the project would be expected to result in a less than significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.

b. Conflict or Obstruct with State or Local Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is not part of a state or local plan for renewable energy and the project itself does not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for energy efficiency. As noted above, the project would be required to comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to conflicting with or obstructing a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS **Would the project:**		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 l8-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (l994), 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. Construction of the proposed project will involve clearing and grading of the site, which could render the site susceptible to a temporary increase in erosion from the grading and construction activities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

In addition, the project would be subject to the provisions of the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on or across the

permit area; to comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites.

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., i. and ii. Fault Rupture, Ground Shaking – *Less than Significant Impact*. The City of Rocklin is located in an area known to be subject to seismic hazards, but it is not near any designated Alquist-Priolo active earthquake faults. The Foothill Fault System has been identified in previous environmental studies as potentially posing a seismic hazard to the area; however, the Foothill Fault system is located near Folsom Lake, and not within the boundaries of the City of Rocklin. There are, however, two known and five inferred inactive faults within the City of Rocklin. Existing building code requirements are considered adequate to reduce potential seismic hazards related to the construction and operation of the multi-family development project to a less than significant level.

a., iii. and iv. Liquefaction, Landslides – *Less than Significant Impact*. The site does not contain significant grade differences and therefore, does not possess the slope/geological conditions that involve landslide hazards. The potential for liquefaction due to earthquakes and groundshaking is considered minimal due to the site-specific characteristics that exist in Rocklin; Rocklin is located over a stable granite bedrock formation and much of the area is covered by volcanic mud (not unconsolidated soils which have liquefaction tendencies). Application of 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 multi-family development project to a less than significant level.

b. Soil Erosion – *Less Than Significant Impact*. 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 the proposed multi-family development project, as well as compliance with the above noted Ordinances, would reduce potential erosion-related impacts to a less than significant level for on-site grading.

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

e. Inadequate Soils for Disposal - *No Impact.* Sewer service is available to the project site and the multi-family development project will be served by public sewer. Septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be necessary; therefore, there are no impacts associated with the disposal of wastewater.

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS **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:

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

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

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

The General Plan EIR concluded that despite these goals and policies, significant greenhouse gas emission impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

An Air Quality/GHG report was prepared by Marc Papineau (with the firm of Environmental Service) for the project, dated July 14, 2021. The report is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Environmental Service 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 Environmental Service report, which is summarized below. This report provided a comparison of the air quality and greenhouse gas emission modeling results for the 2020 Raney Planning and Management report with the modeling results based on the revised project specifics, and the project-specific results are used in the discussion and analysis 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 development of a 237-unit multi-family residential apartment complex 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.)

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 (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), nitrogen trifluoride (NF_3), and hydrofluorocarbons. To account for the warming potential of GHGs, GHG emissions are quantified and reported as CO_2 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 (CO_2) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants such as methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO_2 equivalents ($MTCO_2e/yr$).

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 $MTCO_2e$/yr. For operational emissions, the updated thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MT CO_2e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MT CO_2e/yr threshold is judged by the PCAPCD as having a less than significant impact on GHG emissions within the District and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Projects that would result in emissions above the 1,100 MT CO_2e/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 GHG OPERATIONAL THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
Efficiency Thresholds			
Residential (MT CO_2e/capita)		**Non-Residential (MT CO_2e/1,000 sf)**	
Urban	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Rural**
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA, October 13, 2016.			

Projects that fall below the 1,100 MT CO_2e/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 CO_2e/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 CO_2e/yr for all types of projects.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b.) Generate Greenhouse Gas and Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO_2) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) associated with mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. Because the proposed project involves increased vehicle use in the area, the GHG emissions related to increased vehicle use in the area must be analyzed. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO_2 equivalents (MT CO_2e), based on the global warming potential of the individual pollutants.

Similar to criteria air pollutants, the PCAPCD has identified the approximate size of a project for selected land use categories that would result in operational GHG emissions equal to the bright-line threshold of 10,000 MTCO2e/yr and the screening level threshold of 1,100 MTCO2e/yr based on CalEEMod modeling. Thus, if a project is equal to or less than the size identified by the PCAPCD, the project would not be expected to result in emissions of GHG in excess of the applicable thresholds of significance.

Short-term emissions of GHG associated with construction of the project are estimated at the highest to be 362 $MTCO_2e$/year, which is below the PCAPCD's Bright Line Threshold of 10,000 $MTCO_2e$/year threshold. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change. Due to the size of the proposed project, the project's estimated construction-related GHG contribution to global climate change would be considered negligible on the overall global emissions scale.

The long-term operational GHG emissions estimate for the development project incorporates the project's potential area source and vehicle emissions, emissions associated with utility and water usage, and the generation of wastewater and solid waste. The annual GHG emissions associated with the project would be 2,426 $MTCO_2e$/year which would be in excess of the 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ significance threshold. However, the project's operational GHG emissions would be below the PCACPD's Bright Line Threshold of 10,000 MTCO2e/yr.

As presented in the table above, the PCAPCD efficiency thresholds are broken down into residential or non-residential project types, and further broken down into urban or rural settings.

Accordingly, the proposed project's operational GHG emissions per capita are compared to the efficiency threshold for an urban residential project type of 4.5 $MTCO_2e$/yr/capita. Based on an estimated population for the project, the operational GHG emissions per capita are estimated to be 3.5 MTCO2e/yr/capita, which is below the applicable efficiency threshold.

Because the levels of construction emissions are below the 10,000 $MTCO_2e$/year significance threshold and the project's operational GHG emissions per capita is estimated to be below the urban residential efficiency threshold of 4.5 MTCO2e/yr/capita, the project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target nor conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs and the impact of the project on global climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would be considered less than significant.

X. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS **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:

The development and operation of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would result in construction and operational activities which will include associated potential hazards and hazardous materials.

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

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

protection of persons and property in the event of fires, floods, storms, epidemic, riot, earthquake and other disasters.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Terracon Consultants, Inc., a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in hazardous conditions assessments, prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment report for the Lonetree Apartments project. The report, dated December 23, 2020, is available for public review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Terracon Consultants, Inc. has a professional reputation that makes their conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Terracon Consultants, Inc. report, which is summarized below.

In summary, the Terracon Consultants, Inc. report included records searches of selected federal and state environmental regulatory databases as well as responses from state and local regulatory agencies. The Department of Toxic Substances Control provided a response to Terracon indicating records were not identified for the site. Historical information was reviewed and site reconnaissance visits were made. As a result of those efforts, Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) or Controlled RECs (CRE#C) were not identified in connection with the site and the report concluded that no additional investigations were warranted.

Significance Conclusion:

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

c. Hazardous Emissions Near Schools – ***Less Than Significant Impact.*** There are two existing schools within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of the project site, namely the Seavy Center School and the Western Sierra Collegiate Academy located approximately 100 feet and 400 feet

northwest of the project site, respectively. Although residential projects of this nature would not typically emit any significant amounts of hazardous materials, substances, or waste or be involved in the transportation of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, 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.* The project site is not on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Government Code 65962.5 is known as the Cortese List. The Cortese database identifies public drinking water wells with detectable levels of contamination, hazardous substance sites selected for remedial action, sites with known toxic material identified through the abandoned site assessment program, sites with Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) having a reportable release and all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is known migration. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database were searched on April 14, 2022 and no open hazardous sites were identified on the project site; therefore, there is no impact related to a hazardous materials site on the project site.

e. Public Airport Hazards – *No Impact.* The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, there is no public or private airport hazard impact.

f. Emergency Response Plan – *Less than Significant Impact.* The City's existing street system, particularly arterial and collector streets, function as emergency evacuation routes. The project's layout and design would not impair or physically interfere with the street system emergency evacuation route or impede an emergency evacuation plan; therefore, a less than significant impact on emergency routes/plans would be anticipated.

g. Wildland Fires – *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is located in a mostly developed area, surrounded by undeveloped recreation-conservation areas and light industrial, office and residential development. Additionally, the project has been reviewed by the Rocklin Fire Department and has been designed with adequate emergency access for use by the Rocklin Fire Department to reduce the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires to a less than significant level.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY **Would the project:**	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:			**X**		
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:

The proposed project would involve grading activities that would remove vegetation and expose soil to wind and water erosion and potentially impact water quality. Waterways in the Rocklin area have the potential to flood and expose people or structures to flooding. Additional impervious surfaces would be created with the development of the proposed project.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as well as relevant standards from the City's Improvement Standards for hydrology and water quality impacts will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

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

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., b., c., and e. Water Quality Standards and Groundwater Management – *Less than Significant Impact.* Storm water runoff from the project site will be collected in stormwater drainage pipes and then directed through water quality treatment devices/areas as Best Management Practices (BMP) and/or Low Impact Development (LID) features and then into the City's storm drain system. The purpose of the BMP/LID features is to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system. The purposes of the BMP/LID features are to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system and to provide opportunities for groundwater recharge. The City's storm drain system maintains the

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

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because the City's policies of requiring new developments to detain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels (unless the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's Flood Control Manual requires otherwise) and to coordinate with other projects' master plans to ensure no adverse cumulative effects will be applied. 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, and exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems would not be anticipated to occur.

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

The project will use domestic water from the Placer County Water Agency and not use wells or groundwater; therefore, existing groundwater resources will not be depleted. The project site itself is not a substantial recharge area because of its smaller size in comparison to the overall groundwater recharge area. The City's policies of requiring new developments to retain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels and implementation of Low Impact Development features will ensure that groundwater recharge

rates are also maintained at pre-development levels. Therefore, groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded or supplies decreased and conflicts with, obstruction of or impediment of a sustainable groundwater management plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

d. Release of Pollutants in Flood Hazard, Tsunami or Seiche Zones – *Less Than Significant Impact.* According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps (Map Panel 06061C0941H, effective date November 2, 2018 and 06061C0963H) the developable portion of the project site is located in flood zone X, which indicates that the project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and outside of the 500-year flood hazard area. The westernmost portion of the western parcel is considered to be Regulatory Floodway (Zone AE). As proposed, a small portion of the project along the western boundary of the project site would encroach into a portion of Zone AE.

In accordance with City Engineering requirements, the applicant has prepared and submitted a Flood Zone Development Permit for the project. This permit states that the project would adjust the floodway boundary while providing the same, or slightly greater, storage volume so there is no negative impact to the FEMA floodway. This revised boundary would be in the same general location as the current boundary. The boundary and model of the floodway would then be modified and documented as required by FEMA, which will include a required Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR).

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 project would 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.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING **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:

Approval of the project would allow construction of a 237-unit multifamily residential community on 9.7 acres. The Project would include parking and landscaping as well as indoor and outdoor amenities such as a clubhouse, children's play area, and swimming pool. As discussed below, land use impacts are not anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a "program EIR" under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on land use as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included dividing an established community and potential conflicts with established land uses within and adjacent to the City (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.1-1 through 4.1-38). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in land use impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding land use impacts.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to land use incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Division of Community – *No Impact.* The project site is currently vacant and the entire project is within the City of Rocklin. The proposed construction of a 237-unit multifamily apartment complex would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there is no division of community impact.

b. Plan, Policy or Regulation Conflict – *Less than Significant Impact.* The site's current General Plan designation is High-Density Residential (HDR), with a density range of 15.5 units and greater per acre. The site is zoned Planned Development Residential, 24 Units Per Acre Minimum (PD-24+). As proposed, the project is consistent with the HDR General Plan designation and the PD-24+ zoning district. Therefore, the project 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.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES **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 project is not anticipated to have a mineral resources impact.

XIII. NOISE **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:

As discussed below, development of the proposed project will result in an increase in short-term noise impacts from construction activities. Compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies, and the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines would reduce construction noise related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

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 Ldn and the maximum allowable interior noise level standard is 45 dB Ldn.

Traffic Noise

During the original General Plan Amendment and Rezone of the project site in 2021, 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 Ldn were calculated for existing and future traffic volumes. Distances from the centerlines of selected roadways to the 60 and 65 dB Ldn 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 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. The closest point to SR65 on the project site is approximately 900 feet away. 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.

As part of the proposed project, in order to determine traffic noise levels on the project site, Veneklasen Associates, Inc. (Veneklasen) prepared an exterior noise and exterior façade acoustical analysis, dated January 25, 2022. This report was prepared to predict the exterior noise level at the site using measurements and computer modeling. The report is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Veneklasen Associates 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 Veneklasen report, which is summarized below.

Traffic on Atherton Drive and SR-65 was the primary source of noise affecting the site. Veneklasen visited the site on two occasions, May 31 and June 1, 2021, and made short-term noise measurements during daytime, morning commute, and nighttime from five (5) calculation points. Points S1, S2, S4, and S5 are at the corners of the project site, with S3 located on the site to the site directly to the east, near the intersection of Atherton Road and Lonetree Boulevard.

Measured Sound Levels				
Location	**Leq, Day**	**Leq, Rush Hour**	**Leq, Night**	**Calculated Ldn**
S1	46	--	51	61
S2	49	60	--	61
S3	65	68	--	68
S4	46	52	--	58
S5	47	48	--	57

Veneklasen utilized the Traffic Noise Model computer software program developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) TNM 2.5 in order to predict vehicular noise levels at various locations. The primary purpose of the computer model was to determine how the noise environment will change due to traffic and site changes.

Traffic counts for local streets were not available. Traffic counts for CA-65 were available from Caltrans. In non-pandemic years the ADT was approximately 80,000, up from approximately 77,000 in 2016. This achieves 59 Ldn at position S5. Applying a similar trend 10 years into the future the conservative estimated ADT is 86,000 which increases the Ldn by 2 dB. With no ADT information, local streets will be increased by 1 dB; the freeway noise will be absorbed into these increased levels at the local streets. The estimated future Ldn's are shown below and will be used for the overall exposure and interior calculations.

Future Sound Levels	
Location	**Calculated Ldn**
S1	62
S2	62
S3	69
S4	61
S5	61

Based on the computer model and measurements, Veneklasen calculated the noise level at different locations across the project site. It was determined that the predicted sound levels which would exceed 60 Ldn. However, it should be noted that the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard applies specifically to outdoor use areas or "outdoor activity" areas, which in the project's case are the common areas adjacent to the pool. This area is more than 500 feet west of Lone Tree Boulevard and more than 1,500 feet east of SR-65, and is also shielded by property buildings which would further reduce the noise levels. According to Veneklasen, this would bring the noise levels to less than 60 Ldn and would comply with the City of Rocklin 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard. Therefore, no additional exterior traffic noise reduction measures would be required.

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 of the project boundary, Western Sierra Collegiate Academy located approximately 450 feet to the west, St. Matthew Lutheran Church located approximately 700 feet to the southeast, Knowledge Tree Children's Academy located approximately 2,100 feet to the northeast, and the future West Oaks Townhomes located approximately 2,000 feet to the east. The proposed 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

Veneklasen calculated the interior level within the residential units given the measured noise environment and the exterior façade construction described above. The table below shows the predicted interior Ldn noise levels based on the windows and doors with Sound Transition Class (STC) ratings as shown. Using an STC window/door rating of 28, the standard construction is sufficient in all other areas of the project to achieve less than 45 Ldn, according to the report.

Calculated Interior Ldn Noise Levels			
Location	Exterior Noise Level, Ldn	Window/Door Rating	Interior Noise Level, Ldn
Building Exterior (Perimeter)	61-62	STC 28	<45

The following summarizes the acoustical items required to satisfy the noise criteria as described in this report.

- Exterior wall assembly is acceptable as assumed in the report (3-coat stucco over sheathing on wood studs with a single layer of gypsum board on the interior and batt insulation in the cavity).
- The roof assembly was included in our calculations and is not a significant path of sound and can remain as designed.
- Windows and glass doors with minimum STC rating of 28 are required.
- No changes for the common exterior area are required.

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 With Mitigation.*** 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.

Construction and operation 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 regard to resident noise levels within the proposed multifamily apartment complex, as noted above, exterior noise levels at any outdoor activity areas for a future multi-family development project are not predicted to exceed the City's 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level, and therefore would be considered less than significant.

As stated above, unmitigated interior noise levels have the potential to exceed the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. However, provided that the project complies with the recommendation from Veneklasen regarding window/door rating, these levels would be reduced below the threshold requirement. To address this, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

XIII.-1 The project shall install windows and exterior doors which have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 for all buildings within the project.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's building permits and shall be implemented during construction.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to interior noise levels to a less than significant level.

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 an airport, and is therefore not subject to obtrusive aircraft noise related to airport operations. Therefore, there is no airport related noise impact.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING **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:

The proposed project will result in the construction of 237-unit multifamily apartment complex, which would not induce substantial population growth or displace substantial numbers of people.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Population Growth – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is currently designated on the City's General Plan land use map as High Density Residential (HDR). The project site is currently zoned Residential 24+ units per acre (PD-24+). The proposed development of 237 multifamily units is consistent with both the General Plan designation and the zoning.

The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site 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, as 237 dwelling units equates to 0.8 percent of the anticipated 29,283 Citywide dwelling units). Therefore, the project will have a less than significant population growth impact.

b. Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing People or Housing – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would result in construction activities which would result in an increase in population and housing at the project site. However, the project would not be anticipated to displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing. The project site is currently vacant and, although the development of a multi-family residential project at this site would represent an increase in housing, it will not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere will not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	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:

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

a. Police Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of this project site has been reviewed by the Rocklin Police Department in association with their efforts to plan, staff, and equip the police station and provide police services within the City of Rocklin. Development of the proposed project could increase the need for police patrol and police services to the site. Funding for police services is primarily from the general fund, and is provided for as part of the City's budget process. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure police protection services to the site and reduce police protection impacts to less than significant.

a. Parks – *Less than Significant Impact.* The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City of Rocklin. Development of the project site 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 project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure the construction and maintenance of park and recreation facilities and reduce impacts to parks to less than significant.

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

The proposed project, the development and occupation of a 237-unit apartment complex would be anticipated to increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities but not in a way that results in a significant impact.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Increase Park Usage and Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project, a multifamily apartment complex, is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities. The City of Rocklin provides parkland dedication and/or collection of park fees to mitigate for the increased recreational impacts of new residential developments at the time that a parcel or subdivision map is recorded or building permits are issued for multi-family units. The project includes recreational amenities such as a pool and outdoor spaces, but the residents of the proposed project would likely utilize City recreational facilities but the use is anticipated to be minimal and is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of existing facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor is the minimal use anticipated to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Any impact on City recreational facilities would be mitigated by the requirement that the project pay standard Park Development fees and annex into the appropriate maintenance districts. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts regarding the increase in use of recreational facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:					
	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:

The development of a 237-unit multi-family residential complex at this project site would result in construction activities and the occupation of the complex which could result in transportation impacts because an undeveloped site will become developed, but not to a degree that would significantly affect level of service (LOS) standards or result in a substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Prior Environmental Review:

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

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Circulation Element, and include policies that require the monitoring of traffic on City streets to determine improvements needed to maintain an acceptable level of service, updating the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and traffic impact fees, providing for inflationary adjustments to the City's traffic impact fees, maintaining a minimum level of service (LOS) of "C" for all signalized intersections during the PM peak period on an average weekday, maintaining

street design standards, and interconnecting traffic signals and consideration of the use of roundabouts where financially feasible and warranted to provide flexibility in controlling traffic movements at intersections.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Fehr & Peers, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in transportation, prepared traffic impact study (TIS) of the proposed project. Their report, dated February 23, 2022, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Fehr & Peers 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 Fehr and Peers report, which is summarized below.

Standards of Significance

The City's General Plan notes that Level of Service (LOS) C is the minimum standard but that a reduced LOS may be accepted during the p.m. peak hour under identified circumstances. Based on the LOS C threshold, if an intersection is already operating at an unsatisfactory LOS, then an increase of 0.05 to the vehicle/capacity (v/c) ratio at a signalized intersection would be considered a measurable worsening of intersection operations and therefore would constitute an exceedance of the City's LOS C policy. If an un-signalized intersection is already operating at an unsatisfactory LOS (i.e., LOS D or worse), then the addition of more than 5% of the total traffic at an intersection would be an exceedance of the City's LOS C policy.

As part of the Fehr & Peers TIS, an analysis of the trip generation yields that would result from the development of the project 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 of High Density Residential and Residential 24+ units per acre. While 237 multifamily units are proposed, the TIS analyzed a project build-out of 240 multifamily units.

The table below identifies the resulting trip generation estimates for the proposed project. As shown, the proposed residential project would generate 1,774 daily trips, with 110 trips occurring during the a.m. peak hour and 129 trips occurring during the p.m. peak hour.

Lone Tree Apartments Vehicle Trip Generation Estimate

ITE Land Use (Code)	Dwelling Units	Trip Generation Estimate[1]						
		Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	240	1,774	110	25	85	129	81	48

Notes:

1. Vehicle trip generation estimate calculated using fitted curve equations obtained from *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017) for multifamily housing (low rise) (land use code 220). See prior page for explanation why this resource is used.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2022.

Current Background Traffic Conditions

The project would be fenced and gated. The vehicular access to the project will be on West Oaks Boulevard at the southeast corner of the project site, approximately 375 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard. This vehicular access would include gated access and would be located opposite the existing driveway to the James Apartment complex on the south side of West Oaks Boulevard.

A secondary gated driveway would be provided via a driveway entrance on Atherton Road at the northeast corner of the project site, approximately 675 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard and 825 feet east of Menlo Drive. Drive aisles (25-foot width) will provide internal access throughout the site. Accessible pedestrian paths are planned around the buildings to provide a walking route for residents. Public sidewalks would be installed along the project frontage on West Oaks Boulevard, consistent with City standards. The existing class II bike lanes on both roadways would be maintained.

Local vehicular access to the project site would be provided by West Oaks Boulevard and Atherton Road. Most project trips would access West Oaks Boulevard and Atherton Road from Lonetree Boulevard. Regional access to the project is provided by State Route 65 (SR 65), which

is a four-lane freeway within the study area. SR 65 has interchanges at Sunset Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard to the north and south of the project site, respectively. The key local arterial and collector roadways in the study area are described below.

West Oaks Boulevard is an arterial roadway that extends east from Lonetree Boulevard to Whitney Ranch Parkway in northwest Rocklin. West of Lonetree Boulevard, it is a two-lane roadway without a posted speed limit and terminates approximately 1,000 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard. East of Lonetree Boulevard, it has one travel lane in each direction separated by a center two-way left-turn lane and has a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour (MPH).

Atherton Road is a two-lane collector roadway that primarily travels through the Atherton Tech Center in northwest Rocklin. It winds through the business park campus connecting to Sunset Boulevard at the north and Lonetree Boulevard at the south. It has a posted speed limit of 25 MPH.

Lonetree Boulevard is a north-south arterial roadway that parallels SR 65 from Sunset Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard. Lonetree Boulevard has two travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median. It has a posted speed limit of 45 MPH from Sunset Boulevard to West Oaks Boulevard and 40 MPH from West Oaks Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

Sunset Boulevard is an arterial roadway that travels from Foothills Boulevard North at its western terminus to Woodside Drive (just east of Pacific Street) at its eastern terminus. It features a full interchange with SR 65 approximately a half-mile north of the project site. It generally has three travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median, except around the Atherton Road/ University Avenue intersection, where it has two travel lanes in each direction. It has a posted speed limit of 45 MPH.

Blue Oaks Boulevard is an east-west arterial roadway that extends west from Sunset Boulevard in Rocklin to west Roseville. It features a full interchange with SR 65 approximately one mile south of the project site. Within Rocklin, it has two travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median, and a posted speed limit of 45 MPH.

Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions

The table below reflects project trips added onto current background traffic volumes to create the "Existing Plus Project" condition.

Peak Hour Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Project Conditions

Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Existing + Project	
			Delay[1]	LOS[2]	Delay[1]	LOS[2]
1. University Ave./Atherton Rd. / Sunset Blvd.	Signal	AM	26	C	26	C
		PM	21	C	21	C
2. Sunset Blvd. / Lonetree Blvd./W. Stanford Ranch Rd.	Signal	AM	23	C	24	C
		PM	20	C	22	C
3. Lonetree Blvd. / Atherton Rd.	Signal	AM	10	A	10	A
		PM	5	A	6	A
4. Lonetree Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	12	B	14	B
		PM	13	B	14	B
5. Sunset Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	23	C	23	C
		PM	19	B	19	B
6. Lonetree Blvd./Fairway Dr. / Blue Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	34	C	35	C
		PM	32	C	33	C

Notes:

1. Average control delay (rounded to nearest second) for signalized intersections is the weighted average for all movements.
2. LOS = level of service

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2022.

As shown, the addition of project traffic does not result in any change to the a.m. or p.m. peak hour Level of Service (LOS) at any location. Levels of Service at all intersections will remain within the adopted minimum standard (i.e., LOS C or better) and the project does not exceed the City's LOS C policy in terms of intersection LOS for the existing plus project condition.

Existing Plus Approved Projects Condition

The "baseline" traffic impacts of the project have been considered within the context of traffic conditions in this area of Rocklin assuming occupancy of other approved but as yet unconstructed projects under an "Existing Plus Approved Projects" (EPAP) condition, which is reflected in the table below. The other approved but as yet unconstructed projects include the following: West Oaks Townhomes, Domum and SDG Headquarters, Stanford Ranch Storage, James Apartments, Strikes Outdoor Volleyball, Maverik Gas Station, Whitney Ranch Chevron and Gas Station, Terracina at Whitney Ranch, Tractor Supply, Whitney Ranch Single Family Developments.

In addition to the land development projects listed above, the City of Rocklin directed Fehr & Peers to include Placer Parkway Phase 1 in the existing plus approved projects scenario. Placer Parkway would be constructed as a four-lane expressway from SR 65 westerly to Foothills Boulevard North. Placer Parkway Phase 1 would also include completion of a full SR 65 / Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway interchange. Currently, this is a partial interchange with only

access to Whitney Ranch Parkway on the east side of SR 65. The current partial interchange does not have access from southbound SR 65 to Whitney Ranch Parkway. Under existing plus approved projects conditions, the southbound off-ramp from SR 65 to Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway would be added, as would ramp movements to/from Placer Parkway to the west.

The table below reflects project trips added onto current background traffic volumes to create the "Existing Plus Project" condition.

Peak Hour Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions

Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions		Existing Plus Approved Projects + Project Conditions	
			Delay[1]	LOS[2]	Delay[1]	LOS[2]
1. University Ave./Atherton Rd. / Sunset Blvd.	Signal	A.M.	28	C	29	C
		P.M.	22	C	22	C
2. Sunset Blvd. / Lonetree Blvd./W. Stanford Ranch Rd.	Signal	A.M.	24	C	24	C
		P.M.	21	C	21	C
3. Lonetree Blvd. / Atherton Rd.	Signal	A.M.	10	B	10	B
		P.M.	6	A	6	A
4. Lonetree Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	A.M.	13	B	15	B
		P.M.	14	B	15	B
5. Sunset Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	A.M.	31	C	31	C
		P.M.	22	C	22	C
6. Lonetree Blvd./Fairway Dr. / Blue Oaks Blvd.	Signal	A.M.	38	D	39	D
		P.M.	34	C	35	C

Notes:

1. Average control delay (rounded to nearest second) for signalized intersections is the weighted average for all movements.

2. LOS = level of service

Bold indicates deficient operations. Operating goal applies to PM peak hour conditions only.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2022.

As shown, development of the project will increase the volume of traffic on study area roads. However, the LOS at all study intersections will not change. Lonetree Boulevard/Fairway Drive / Blue Oaks Boulevard would operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions both with and without the proposed project, with the v/c ratio increasing from 0.86 to 0.87 with the project. However, the table also shows that the project is expected to increase delay at this intersection by no more than one second per vehicle, compared to existing plus project conditions. Under previous City of Rocklin guidance, an increase of average control delay

of less than five seconds per vehicle was not considered significant since this increase in delay would likely not be perceptible to most motorists.

Future (Cumulative Year 2030) Traffic Conditions

For the discussion of cumulative impacts, CEQA Guidelines section 15130 provides for a choice of two approaches, using a list approach or summary of projections contained in an adopted plan such as a general plan and its associated environmental document. In this instance, the summary of projections method has been utilized and information from the General Plan EIR has been employed to identify long term traffic conditions in the project vicinity. The table below compares cumulative p.m. peak hour Levels of Service at study area intersections with and without the proposed project.

Peak Hour Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions

Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project Conditions		Cumulative Plus Project Conditions	
			Delay[1]	LOS[2]	Delay[1]	LOS[2]
1. University Ave./Atherton Rd. / Sunset Blvd.	Signal	AM	31	C	32	C
		PM	30	C	30	C
2. Sunset Blvd. / Lonetree Blvd./W. Stanford Ranch Rd.	Signal	AM	53	D	53	D
		PM	**40**	**D**	**40**	**D**
3. Lonetree Blvd. / Atherton Rd.	Signal	AM	12	B	12	B
		PM	7	A	7	A
4. Lonetree Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	19	B	20	C
		PM	20	B	21	C
5. Sunset Blvd. / West Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	27	C	28	C
		PM	25	C	26	C
6. Lonetree Blvd./Fairway Dr. / Blue Oaks Blvd.	Signal	AM	52	D	53	D
		PM	**56**	**E**	**57**	**E**

Notes:

1. Average control delay (rounded to nearest second) for signalized intersections is the weighted average for all movements.

2. LOS = level of service

Bold indicates deficient operations. Operating goal applies to PM peak hour conditions only.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2022.

The table above shows that the following study intersections would operate at LOS D or LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour:

- Sunset Boulevard / Lonetree Boulevard/W. Stanford Ranch Road would operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions both with and without the proposed project.
- Lonetree Boulevard/Fairway Drive / Blue Oaks Boulevard would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions both with and without the proposed project.

However, the table also shows that the project is expected to increase delay at these two intersections by no more than one second per vehicle, compared to cumulative no project conditions. Under previous City of Rocklin guidance, an increase of average control delay of less than five seconds per vehicle was not considered significant since this increase in delay would likely not be perceptible to most motorists.

Significance Conclusions:

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

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

South Placer Regional Transportation Authority

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

Highway 65 Interchange Improvement Fee

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

The development of the proposed project and the resulting addition of the proposed multifamily project would not result in project-specific significant effects as demonstrated by the summary of the project's traffic impact analysis presented above.

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 project does not conflict with these bike lane locations or with other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation. Transit service in the project vicinity is provided by Placer County Transit (PCT). The bus route closest to the project site is the Lincoln/Rocklin/Sierra College which runs a continuous route between Lincoln and Sierra College, with stops nearest the project site being at Sunset Boulevard/Lonetree Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road, and Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard. The project does not conflict with these bus route or stop locations or other policies or programs promoting alternative transportation.

The City of Rocklin's Zoning Ordinance contains off-street parking requirements for different types of development projects. Section 17.66.020 of the Zoning Ordinance notes that for multi-family residences, a minimum of one and a half paved parking spaces for each one-bedroom unit, and two paved parking spaces for each unit with two or more bedrooms, plus twenty-five percent paved visitor parking spaces. At least one parking space per unit shall be covered. The proposed project is consistent with these requirements.

Pursuant to the TIS, the project would result in a potential increase in disruptions to the bicycle travel on West Oaks Boulevard from increased on-street parking demand occupying the existing Class II bike lane. The existing Class II bike lanes on West Oaks Boulevard and Atherton Road would be maintained at the project driveways. This would be similar to adjacent driveways on West Oaks Boulevard and Atherton Road, and the project driveways would not significantly disrupt or interfere with these existing bicycle facilities. The project would not preclude construction of any planned bicycle facilities as identified in the *City of Rocklin Parks and Trails Master Plan* (2017).

Field observations as part of the TIS show that many vehicles park on-street in the existing Class II bike lanes on both sides of West Oaks Boulevard from the project frontage to Lonetree Boulevard. It is likely much of the on-street parking demand is generated by the adjacent James Apartments. In a similar manner, residents or visitors of the proposed project may increase demand for on-street parking on West Oaks Boulevard. This could result in most of the bike lane being occupied by parked vehicles, which could impede bicycle travel on West Oaks Boulevard. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.

To address this, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

XVII.-1 The project applicant shall install no parking signage on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard along the project frontage easterly to Lonetree Boulevard.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to bike lane conflicts to a less than significant level.

Assuming the no parking zone is enforced, this mitigation would reduce on-street parking demand and thereby reduce disruptions to the bike lane for bicycle travel. Therefore, this mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant**.**

In addition, the project would potentially generate pedestrian travel that is not adequately served by the existing pedestrian facilities. The project would construct public sidewalks along the project frontage on West Oaks Boulevard, consistent with City standards. The existing sidewalks on Atherton Road along the project frontage would be maintained. The project driveways would cross the sidewalks similar to adjacent driveways on West Oaks Boulevard and Atherton Road, and the project driveways would not significantly disrupt or interfere with the sidewalks.

Pedestrians walking from the project via West Oaks Boulevard would have a sidewalk along the project frontage. However, there would be a gap in the sidewalk network between the project and Lonetree Boulevard, along the undeveloped frontage of the vacant property immediately east of the project site (APN 017-281-016). This lack of pedestrian connectivity would be

potentially inconsistent with Policy C-59 of the Rocklin General Plan Circulation Element. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.

To address this, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

XVII.-2 The project applicant shall install a sidewalk on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard extending easterly from the project driveway to Lonetree Boulevard.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to pedestrian facilities to a less than significant level.

This mitigation would eliminate the sidewalk gap and provide the necessary pedestrian connectivity to serve pedestrian demand generated by the project. Therefore, this mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant**.**

b. Conflict or Inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program – *Less Than Significant Impact*. Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which was signed by Governor Brown on September 27, 2013, created a process to change the way transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA by moving away from the more traditional traffic flow and delay metric of Level of Service (LOS) to an alternative metric known as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) is a transportation performance metric that is used as an input to air quality and noise analyses. VMT not only addresses the number of trips generated by a given land use, but also the length of those trips. By doing so, the placement of a given land use in proximity to complementary land uses, and available transit, walking and bicycling facilities are all considered. VMT can also be used to quantify the effects of proposed changes to a roadway network, transportation demand strategies, and investments in non-auto travel modes. VMT may be expressed in absolute numbers of as "per capita" rations, such as VMT per person, household, dwelling unit, employee, or service population (persons plus employees). The requirement to incorporate VMT as a metric in CEQA documents became effective on December 28, 2018 with the addition of section 15064.3 to the CEQA Guidelines. Per section 15064.3 (c), the provisions of section 15064.3 shall apply statewide, beginning on July 1, 2020.

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 SACOG region, this consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTS/SCS).

The project would construct a multiple family apartment complex 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 MPT/SCS to achieve identified air quality targets.

According to the MPT/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 <= 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 <= 50-85% and <= 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 this location instead would provide opportunities for individuals residing at this location to work in closer proximity to existing surrounding job generating land uses.

There is bus service available along Sunset Boulevard and Lonetree Boulevard and bus stops in the project vicinity, so the use of bus service by residents of the project 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 project.

Therefore, because the project site is zoned and designated for high density residential, and because the proposed project would facilitate construction of high density residential units within an area of the City which has some of the largest employment centers, impacts to VMT are not anticipated to be significant.

c. and d. Hazards and Emergency Access – *Less than Significant Impact*. The proposed project is evaluated by the City's Engineering Services Manager to assess such items as hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. In addition, the proposed project is evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin's Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant hazard or emergency access impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES					
	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:

The project site does not contain any resources that are listed with the California Register of Historical Resources or that have been determined by the lead agency to have significance to a California Native American Tribe. Therefore, no impacts to tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Tribal Cultural Resources –*Less Than Significant 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 Ione 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 9/20/2021, 9/23/2021, 9/21/2021 and 9/21/2021, respectively. All three tribes had 30 days to request consultation on the project pursuant to AB-52. Throughout that 30-day period, only the UAIC had responded on 9/30/2021. No responses were received from the IBMI, SSBMI, or TMDCI.

Through email correspondence between City staff and the UAIC, it was stated that the tribal representative had reviewed their database and did not see any previously recorded tribal cultural resources in the project area, although several do exist in the immediate vicinity. Correspondence said that the geotechnical report states that there is bedrock around 3 feet below surface, which indicates that there is a low probability for buried sites to be present. However, because there are recorded resources in the immediate vicinity, the UAIC requested for a post-ground disturbance site visit and unanticipated discoveries measure be incorporated into the project.

To address the UAIC's concerns, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, are being applied to the project to address the potential for buried Tribal Cultural Resources (TRCs) that may be unearthed during ground disturbing activities:

XVIII.-1 A minimum of seven days prior to beginning earthwork, clearing and grubbing, or other soil disturbing activities, the applicant shall notify lead agency of the proposed earthwork start-date. The lead agency shall contact the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) with the proposed earthwork start-date and a UAIC Tribal Representative or Tribal Monitor shall be invited to inspect the project site, including any soil piles, trenches, or other disturbed areas, within the first five days of groundbreaking activity, or as appropriate for the type and size of project. During this inspection, a UAIC Tribal Representative or Tribal

Monitor may provide an on-site meeting for construction personnel information on TCRs and workers awareness brochure.

If any TCRs are encountered during this initial inspection, or during any subsequent construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find and the measures included in the ***Inadvertent/Unanticipated Discoveries Mitigation Measure (XVIII.-2)*** *shall be implemented. Preservation in place is the preferred alternative under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort must be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign.*

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize significant effects to the resources, including the use of a paid Native American Monitor during ground disturbing activities.

XVIII.-2 If any suspected TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. A Tribal Representative from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074). The Tribal Representative will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

When avoidance is infeasible, preservation in place is the preferred option for mitigation of TCRs under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort shall be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign, if feasible. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by UAIC or by the California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. Treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a TCR may include Tribal Monitoring, culturally appropriate recovery of cultural objects, and reburial of cultural objects or cultural soil.

Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of the CEQA, including AB52, have been satisfied.

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

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS **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:

The proposed development and occupation of a multifamily residential apartment complex will increase the need for utility and service systems, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the utility and service providers to adequately provide such services.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Water Supplies – *Less than Significant Impact.* The 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 project's water supply and treatment facility impacts would be considered less than significant.

d. and e. Solid Waste – *Less than Significant Impact.* The Western Regional landfill, which serves the Rocklin area, has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. The estimated closure 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 project will comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations regarding trash and waste and other nuisance-related issues as may be applicable. Recology would provide garbage collection services to the project site, provided their access requirements are met.

The project is 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:

The development of a multifamily residential apartment complex at this project site would result in construction activities and the occupation of the complex which is expected to increase the need for fire and emergency responses to the project site, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the fire and emergency responders to adequately provide such services.

The project is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA). There are no locations in Rocklin that are classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Impair Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan – *Less than Significant Impact.* The project occurs on a project site that is contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project site does not include any features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The streets adjacent to the project site serve as emergency evacuation corridors and would provide direct fire vehicle access to the site. In addition, the project has been 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 site may in fact help reduce the potential fire risk. Therefore, the project will not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan and the impact will be less than significant.

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

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE		**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			**X**		

	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)?					
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 with Mitigation.* The proposed project site is partly surrounded by disturbed and developed land. Based on the project location and the application of mitigation measures for potential biological resources and cultural resources as discussed above, the proposed project does not have the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Although the proposed project could cause a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because of the project design and the application of the recommended mitigation measures and the City's uniformly applied development policies and standards that will reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts with mitigation.

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 project-specific air quality analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impact. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

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

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

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in significant transportation/traffic impacts as a result of the creation of additional housing, employment and purchasing opportunities which generate vehicle trips. As a result, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative transportation/traffic impacts. The project-specific traffic analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative traffic impact. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

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

c. Adverse Effects to Humans – *Less than Significant Impact.* Because the development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General

Plan EIR, the 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
Fehr & Peers, Transportation Impact Study for Lonetree Apartments, February 23, 2022
Marc Papineau, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Memorandum, July 14, 2021
Olberding Environmental, Inc., Biological Resource Analysis Report for the Rocklin Apartments Property, January 2021
Peak & Associates, Inc., Determination of Eligibility and Effect for the Lonetree Apartments Project, July 28, 2021
Raney Planning and Management, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, September, 2020
Veneklasen Associates, LLC, Exterior Noise and Exterior Façade Acoustical Analysis, January 25, 2022

Attachments

Attachment A – Project Vicinity Map

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Lonetree Apartments
(DR2021-0015 and DL2021-0002)

Project Name and Description

The project is a request for approval of a Design Review to construct a 237-unit multifamily residential community on 9.7 acres and a Tentative Parcel Map to remove a "No Vehicular Access" easement on West Oaks Boulevard and to merge the two parcels into a single parcel. The Project would include parking and landscaping as well as indoor and outdoor amenities such as a clubhouse, children's play area, and swimming pool. For more detail please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Project Location

The project site is comprised of two parcels located at the existing terminus of West Oaks Boulevard and bounded on the north by Atherton Road within the City of Rocklin. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 017-281-014 and 017-281-015.

The property owner is GTA Lonetree, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. The applicant is Mark Tekin.

Basis for Mitigated Negative Declaration Determination

The City of Rocklin finds that as originally submitted the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. However, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent, which will avoid these effects or mitigate these effects to a point where clearly no significant effect will occur. Therefore, a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared. The Initial Study supporting the finding stated above and describing the mitigation measures including in the project is incorporated herein by this reference. This determination is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary of Resources Section 15064 – Determining the Significance of the Environmental Effects Caused by a Project, Section 15065 – Mandatory Findings of Significance, and 15070 – Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for this Project.

Date Circulated for Review: April 15, 2022

Date Adopted: _____

Signature: _____
David Mohlenbrok, Community Development Department Director

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
Lonetree Apartments
(DL2021-0002 and DR2021-0015)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., as amended by Chapter 1232) requires all lead agencies before approving a proposed project to adopt a reporting and monitoring program for adopted or required changes to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation as required by AB 3180 (Cortese) effective on January 1, 1989 and Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. This law requires the lead agency responsible for the certification of an environmental impact report or adoption of a mitigated negative declaration to prepare and approve a program to both monitor all mitigation measures and prepare and approve a report on the progress of the implementation of those measures.

The responsibility for monitoring assignments is based upon the expertise or authority of the person(s) assigned to monitor the specific activity. The City of Rocklin Community Development Director or his designee shall monitor to assure compliance and timely monitoring and reporting of all aspects of the mitigation monitoring program.

The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies the mitigation measures associated with the project and identifies the monitoring activities required to ensure their implementation through the use of a table format. The columns identify Mitigation Measure, Implementation and Monitoring responsibilities. Implementation responsibility is when the project through the development stages is checked to ensure that the measures are included prior to the actual construction of the project such as: Final Map (FM), Improvement Plans (IP), and Building Permits (BP). Monitoring responsibility identifies the department responsible for monitoring the mitigation implementation such as: Economic and Community Development (ECD), Public Services (PS), Community Facilities (CFD), Police (PD), and Fire Departments (FD).

The following table presents the Mitigation Monitoring Plan with the Mitigation Measures, Implementation, and Monitoring responsibilities. After the table is a general Mitigation Monitoring Report Form, which will be used as the principal reporting form for this, monitoring program. Each mitigation measure will be listed on the form and provided to the responsible department.

Revisions in the project plans and/or proposal have been made and/or agreed to by the applicant prior to this Negative Declaration being released for public review which will avoid the effects or mitigate those effects to a point where clearly no significant effects will occur. There is no substantial evidence before the City of Rocklin that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15070. These mitigation measures are as follows:

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: *Special-Status Plant Species*

IV.-1 *Prior to any grading or construction activities, pre-construction protocol-level surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the portions of the project site planned for development, in order to identify the presence of any of the following special-status plant species: Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop (Gratiola heterosepala),* Dwarf Downingia *(Downingia pusilla),* Lengenere *(Legenere limosa),* Pincushion Navarretia *(Navarretia myersii ssp. Myersii),* Sacramento Orcutt Grass *(Orcuttis viscidia), . Pre-construction protocol-level surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period (March-October) for all plant species to adequately ensure recognition of potentially-occurring species. Because the blooming period of all potentially-occurring plant species covers a wide range, a minimum of three focused rare plant surveys timed approximately one month apart are recommended from April through June to cover the peak blooming period. The results of the surveys shall be submitted to California Department of Fish & Game and the City of Rocklin for review.*

If, as a result of the survey(s), special-status plant species are determined not to occur on the sites, further action shall not be required. If special-status plant species are detected on either site, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped with GPS and consultation with California Department of Fish & Game shall be initiated, and a mitigation plan shall be prepared based on the consultation. The plan shall detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure no net loss of plant species.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for special-status plant species to the City's Environmental Coordinator, as detailed above. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the locations of these occurrences shall be mapped with GPS and consultation with California Department of Fish & Wildlife shall be initiated, and a mitigation plan shall be prepared based on the consultation.

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of evidence of worker awareness training.

RESPONSIBILITY:

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: *Raptors and Migratory Birds*

IV.-2 *The applicant/developer shall attempt to time the removal of potential nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds to avoid the nesting season (February 1 through September 15).*

If tree and vegetation removal and/or project grading or construction activities would occur during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds (February-September 15), the developer and/or contractor shall hire a qualified biologist approved by the City to conduct pre-construction surveys no more than 14 days prior to initiation of tree and vegetation removal activities. The survey shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be valid for one construction season. Prior to the start of tree and vegetation removal activities, documentation of the survey shall be provided to the City of Rocklin Engineering Department and if the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required and necessary tree and vegetation removal may proceed. If there is a break in construction activities of more than 14 days, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

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

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (September 16 – January 31), a survey is not required and no further studies are necessary.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities to occur within the nesting season, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for nesting raptors and migratory birds to the City's Engineering Department. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the biologist shall consult with the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as detailed above.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant/Developer
Engineering Department and Community Development Director

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: *Swainson's Hawk*

To address the potential impact of the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-3 If an active Swainson's hawk nest tree is located within 1,000 feet of the project site, prior to the start of grading or construction activity, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by providing 0.5 acre of replacement Swainson's hawk habitat land for each acre of land to be developed. The mitigation may be in the form of mitigation bank credits, conservation easements or fee title to an appropriate entity. The location of the habitat area is encouraged, but not required to be within Placer County. Habitats located within the north half of the Central Valley, from the Stanislaus River to Redding shall be deemed acceptable. The applicant shall verify that this condition has been met to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

IMPLEMENTATION:

If an active Swainson's hawk nest tree is located within 1,000 feet of the project site, prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of providing 0.5 acre of replacement Swainson's hawk foraging habitat for each 1.0 acre developed as detailed above to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant
Engineering Department
Community Development Director

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: Burrowing Owls

To address the project's potential impacts to burrowing owls, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

IV.-4 Prior to any grading activities, the applicant/developer shall hire a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction take avoidance survey between 14 and 30 days prior to the commencement of construction, in accordance with the 2012 California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012 Staff Report) (CDFW 2012). The survey area shall include an approximately 500 foot buffer area around the footprint of work activities, where access is permitted. If the surveys are negative, then and a letter report documenting the results of the survey should be provided to the CDFW, City of Rocklin Environmental Services Division and the project proponent for their records, and no additional measures are required. If construction does not commence within 14 days of the pre-construction survey, or halts for more than 14 days, a new survey shall be required.

If burrows are observed within 500 feet of the footprint of work activities, an impact assessment shall be prepared and submitted to the CDFW, in accordance with the 2012 Staff Report. If it is determined that project activities may result in impacts to nesting, occupied, and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat, the biologist shall consult with CDFW and develop a detailed mitigation plan such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows, and burrowing owls impacted are replaced. The mitigation plan shall be implemented prior to any grading activities and/or prior to the issuance of Improvement Plans.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for burrowing owls to the City's Engineering Department, as detailed above. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the City and take additional measures as detailed above.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant/Developer
City of Rocklin Engineering Department
City of Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: Western Pond Turtle

IV.-5 A pre-construction survey for western pond turtle should be conducted within 14 days of the initiation of construction by a qualified biologist prior to any construction activity that would directly impact pond or stream habitat or disturb the ground within 300 feet of aquatic habitat. If no western pond turtles are observed, a letter report should be prepared to document the survey and shall be provided to the City of Rocklin, and no additional measures are recommended. If construction does not commence within 14 days of the pre-construction survey or halts for more than 14 days a new survey should be conducted prior to reinitiating construction.

If western pond turtles are found during the pre-construction survey, then a qualified biological monitor should be onsite during initial clearing and grading within 300 feet of a drainage, pond, or other aquatic habitat. The biological monitor will relocate any western pond turtles found within the construction footprint to suitable habitat away from the construction zone, but within the vicinity of the project site, if required. In addition, a pre-construction worker awareness training should be conducted alerting workers to the presence of and protections for the western pond turtle. Evidence of the pre-construction worker awareness training shall be provided to the City prior to any ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for western pond turtle to the City's Environmental Coordinator, as detailed above. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the biologist shall relocate the turtle(s) as detailed above.

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of evidence of worker awareness training.

RESPONSIBILITY:

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: Spadefoot Toad

IV.-6 *Prior to any grading or construction activities, but no longer than 28 days before, a pre-construction protocol-level survey for western spadefoot toad shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, to determine presence or absence of this species on the project sites. The survey shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable California Department of Fish & Wildlife guidelines. If western spadefoot toads are not found within the project site, no further mitigation is required. If juvenile or adult spadefoot toads are found within the proposed construction area, the individuals shall be moved out of the construction site with technical assistance from California Department of Fish & Wildlife. If spadefoot toad eggs are found within the construction area, construction shall not take place within 30 meters (100 feet) of the nest until the toads have hatched. (ENGINEERING, PLANNING)*

If a spadefoot toad is observed on the site, work shall cease in the area until the frog can be moved to a safe location consistent with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regulations. The survey shall be valid for 28 days; if construction does not start within 28 days of the survey, or if construction activities stop for more than 28 days, a new survey shall be conducted.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:
Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of a survey for spadefoot toad to the City's Environmental Coordinator, as detailed above. If the survey results are negative, no further mitigation is required. If the survey results are positive, the biologist shall relocate the turtle(s) as detailed above.

Prior to the start of grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation of evidence of worker awareness training.

RESPONSIBILITY:
Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources: Waters of the U.S and federally-protected vernal pool species

IV.-7 Prior to any grading or construction activities, the appropriate Section 404 permit will need to be acquired for any project-related impacts to waters of the U.S. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed should be replaced or rehabilitated on a "no-net-loss" basis in accordance with the Corps' mitigation guidelines. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement should be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. In association with the Section 404 permit and prior to the issuance of improvement plans, a Section 401 water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a USFWS Biological Opinion shall be obtained. All terms and conditions of said permits shall be complied with.

Prior to any grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation to the Engineering Department that they have obtained an Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, a Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 water quality certification, and a United States Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion. The applicant shall also demonstrate to the Engineering Department that they have implemented habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement as stipulated in their Section 404 permit. The applicant shall also demonstrate to the Engineering Department how they have, or intend to, comply with the terms and conditions of the Section 404 permit, the Section 401 water quality certification, and the Biological Opinion.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to any grading or construction activities, the applicant shall submit documentation to the Engineering Department that they have obtained an Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, a Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 water quality certification and a USFWS Biological. The applicant shall also demonstrate that they have implemented habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement as stipulated in their Section 404 permit. The applicant shall also demonstrate how they have, or intend to, comply with the terms and conditions of the Section 404 permit, the Section 401 water quality certification the Biological Opinion.

RESPONSIBILITY

Applicant
Engineering Department
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Regional Water Quality Control Board

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Cultural Resources:

V.-1 If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) or tribal cultural resources is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or a tribal cultural resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources would include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts and tribal cultural resources.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e) (1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City's Environmental Services Manager shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

If evidence of undocumented cultural resources is discovered during grading or construction operations, ground disturbance in the area shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the City's Environmental Services Manager and the Native American Heritage

Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. Other procedures as specifically noted in the mitigation measure shall also be followed and complied with.

RESPONSIBILITY:
Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department
Native American Heritage Commission

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Noise: *Generation of Noise or Vibration*

XIII.-1 *The project shall install windows and exterior doors which have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 for all buildings within the project.*

IMPLEMENTATION:
This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's building permits and shall be implemented during construction.

RESPONSIBILITY:
Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Transportation: *West Oaks Boulevard Frontage Parking*

XVII.-1 The project applicant shall install "no parking" signage on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard along the project frontage easterly to Lonetree Boulevard.

IMPLEMENTATION:
Prior to issuance of building permits/improvement plans, the applicant shall include information on the plans which shows installation of "no parking" signage on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard along the project frontage to Lonetree Boulevard. Signage shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director prior to project occupancy.

RESPONSIBILITY:
Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department
Engineering Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Transportation: *Sidewalk Improvements*

XVII.-2 The project applicant shall install a sidewalk on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard extending easterly from the project driveway to Lonetree Boulevard.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Prior to issuance of improvement plans, the applicant shall include information on the plans which shows installation of a sidewalk on the north side of West Oaks Boulevard extending easterly from the project driveway to Lonetree Boulevard. The sidewalk shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director prior to project occupancy.

RESPONSIBILITY:

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department
Engineering Department

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Tribal Cultural Resources:

XVIII.-1 A minimum of seven days prior to beginning earthwork, clearing and grubbing, or other soil disturbing activities, the applicant shall notify lead agency of the proposed earthwork start-date. The lead agency shall contact the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) with the proposed earthwork start-date and a UAIC Tribal Representative or Tribal Monitor shall be invited to inspect the project site, including any soil piles, trenches, or other disturbed areas, within the first five days of groundbreaking activity, or as appropriate for the type and size of project. During this inspection, a UAIC Tribal Representative or Tribal Monitor may provide an on-site meeting for construction personnel information on TCRs and workers awareness brochure.

If any Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) are encountered during this initial inspection, or during any subsequent construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find and the measures included in the ***Inadvertent/Unanticipated Discoveries Mitigation Measure (XVIII.-2)*** *shall be implemented. Preservation in place is the preferred alternative under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort must be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign.*

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize significant effects to the resources, including the use of a paid Native American Monitor during ground disturbing activities.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

A minimum of seven days prior to any grading or construction activities, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Department of the proposed earthwork start-date to begin coordination with the UAIC. Other procedures as specifically noted in the mitigation measure shall also be followed and complied with.

RESPONSIBILITY:

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department
Native American Heritage Commission
United Auburn Indian Community

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Tribal Cultural Resources:

XVIII.-2 If any suspected Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. A Tribal Representative from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074). The Tribal Representative will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

When avoidance is infeasible, preservation in place is the preferred option for mitigation of TCRs under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort shall be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign, if feasible. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by UAIC or by the California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. Treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a TCR may include Tribal Monitoring, culturally appropriate recovery of cultural objects, and reburial of cultural objects or cultural soil.

Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of the CEQA, including AB52, have been satisfied.

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

IMPLEMENTATION:

If evidence of TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the find shall be halted immediately and a qualified Tribal Representative shall be consulted. Other procedures as specifically noted in the mitigation measure shall also be followed and complied with.

RESPONSIBILITY:

Applicant/Developer
Community Development Department
Native American Heritage Commission
United Auburn Indian Community

ATTACHMENT A – PROJECT VICINITY MAP