

164-51	4.2-11	Land Use Policies 13 and 16	This paragraph does not mention the factors association with land use 13 which is residential design standards for hillside and other unique areas. Clover Valley is full of hillsides and is a very unique area. The impacts to land use for policy 13 is severe and unavoidable. This is a huge omissions. There are no facts for how residential design standards will be used or mandated in the project to control the impacts to hillside and unique areas.	omission
164-52	4.2-11	Land Use Policies 6,7 and 9	This section states the project is consistent with these land use policies but other sections conflict with this statement. Land Use Policy 7 as defined on page 4.2-7 states that land use must be consistent with existing neighborhoods. Page 4.2-12, paragraph 3 states there could be potential land use conflicts with properties to the north and east of the site. The final paragraph notes the conflicts with adjacent properties is potentially significant.	factual
164-53	4.2-11		Land Use Policy 17 is not even mentioned and this development contains commercial areas. There must be an analysis of the commercial area designated for this area. Rocklin is plagued by only having commercial areas that you can drive to thus increasing pollution.	omission
164-54	4.2-12	Open Space Policy 20	This section states the project is consistent with open use policy but other sections conflict with this statement. Open Space Policy 20 as defined on page 4.2-8 states that land use must consider development projects "in terms of their visual qualities and compatibility with surrounding areas, especially those urbanizing areas abutting rural or semi-rural areas". Page 4.2-12, paragraph 3 states there could be potential land use conflicts with properties to the north and east of the site. The summary is inconsistent and not factually accurate.	factual
164-55	4.2-12	paragraph 3	The paragraph states there is a "less-than-significant" impact. Page 4.2-11 "Open Space Policies 1,2 and 4" describe the impact as "significant" and "immitgale". There appears to be a factual discrepancy between these two statements.	factual
164-56	4.2-15	4.2MM-3	This mitigation factor is ineffective as can be clearly seen when developers put houses at the end of airport runways. Eventually, the airport has to cease operations and move at great expense to the local community because the residential communities complain so loudly. Statistics would need to be shown that this mitigation would be effective.	factual
164-57	4.2-2	Existing Land Use Descriptions	There is no figure 3-12 in chapter 3	inconsistency
164-58	4.2-2	Medium Density Residential	This section states the density range is 4-8 units per acre but on page 4.2-3 the document states that RD-4 is the maximum classification with a limit of 4 units per acre. Please resolve this inconsistency.	inconsistency

164-59	4.2-6	Table 4.2.3	This table identifies a huge shift from lower density housing to higher density housing which is not consistent with the original land use plan. This fact is not mentioned and appears to be significant.	factual
164-60	4.2-6	Table 4.2-3	Proposed Zoning labels (RD 1.0-1.4, ...) need to be defined.	omission
164-61	4.3-1	Environmental Setting - paragraph 2	Surrounding land to the north and east contains scattered rural residences. These homes appear to always be excluded from most analysis in this section. These homes do not appear on any map of the area.	omission
164-62	4.3-12	4.3I-1, paragraph 3	This states only the southern part of the valley is visible to houses on the east side. I've hiked into this area and the entire valley is visible. There are no photos or evidence to back up this claim.	factual
164-63	4.3-13	4.3MM-1	This mitigation measure does not provide any reduction in impact. Inclusion of this in the EIR is misleading.	misleading
164-64	4.3-14	4.3I-4, paragraph 1	Sentence starting with "However, the project's low-density residential units and park/open space corridor would be visually consistent with off-site homes" is misleading. This project is definitely not consistent with existing homes on the north and east of the valley. This new project proposal for fewer homes sacrifices the original low density plan with a much higher density plan. The new plan eliminates all densities below The new density plan is much like stanford ranch with the elimination of lower density units (1.0-1.9) and the increase in units in higher densities (2.5-4.0). See page 3-22 table 3-4. The proposed house would have very limited side to side spacing and would represent a very crowded look which is very unlike the current look in the valley. Existing homes to the west are not visible to the valley residences and should be removed from the analysis.	misleading
164-65	4.3-14	4.3I-4, paragraph 2	The conclusion of "less that significant" is based on the misleading information in the previous paragraph.	faulty logic
164-66	4.3-15	4.3I-5, paragraph 2	The statement "However, the uses associated with the proposed project are visually consistent with hose in the Whitney Oaks and Twelve Bridges developments". I would agree that the proposed development is some like these developments, just another bunch of close spaced tacky treeless yards. The problem here is clover valley homes cannot be viewed by these developments and the vice versa. Making a comparison here is not valid logic. A very few homes may actually see this valley but I'm sure these home owners bought their view home because of the view and not the planned development. Is there a survey of ridge home owners to support this conclusion?	faulty logic

164-67	4.3-15	4.3I-6	Page 3-22 table 3-4 disagrees with the statements in paragraph 2. Clover Valley woods is a development that is mainly large lots. I don't know the exact rating of adjacent homes but I'm sure they are in the 1.0-1.9 houses per acre. Table 3-4 shows the new plan virtually eliminates the lower density housing in favor of higher densities. Therefore the conclusion in this impact is flawed and should be raised to significant and unavoidable.	factual
164-68	4.3-16	4.3I-7	This section should be split into two sections. The title states that both Clover Valley Creek and Antelope Creek are studied but there is no mention of Antelope Creek in the section.	omission
164-69	4.3-17	4.3I-7	top of the page, states the project feature would be consistent with surrounding developments. Again, this is not compatible with the houses to the north and east. Impact would be significant and unavoidable.	misleading
164-70	4.3-17	Mitigation Measures	It's not clear to me how a conclusion of less-than-significant can be made considering the homes in this valley can only be viewed by homes which currently view this valley. I'm sure these people did not purchase these homes because they wanted to look at a bunch of houses in the valley. Any development in this valley would have a significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact to the area. People who enjoy hiking in this area would be impacted as well as the many people who enjoy bike riding and walking through the existing clover valley development.	faulty logic
164-71	4.3-18	4.3I-8	The second paragraph states the impact as "potentially significant". The mitigation measure states the impact would remain "significant and unavoidable". These statements are conflicting.	inconsistency
164-72	4.3-18,19	Mitigation Measures	Both of these mitigation measures have no effect to the level of impact. Their inclusion in this report is misleading because it makes the reader believe the impact is being mitigated.	misleading
164-73	4.3-2	List of Photos	No photos from the west side of creek. No easterly photos. No photos of existing home to the north or east of the site.	omission
164-74	4.3-20	4.3I-9	Policy 3 of Rocklin's development guidelines state that historically significant areas should be preserved. The title of this section is "historic stone walls". Then the conclusion is "less-than-significant" because the "historic" stone walls are designated historic. This section states the walls are remote and this leads me to conclude the walls may never have been evaluated for their historic value. There are no facts to support the fact that the walls were ever studied by a team and declared not historic. In light of no evidence, the report should err on the side of being potentially historic. The conclusion should be changed to "potentially significant".	faulty logic
164-75	4.3-21	Mitigation Measures	There is no restriction for home lighting especially "up lighting" of trees and outside flood lights. These mitigation measures should be added because of the many oak trees and the desire of many residences to accent these beautiful trees during the nighttime hours.	omission

164-76	4.3-23	4.3I-11	Project entrance signage should be eliminated in the mitigation measure. These project entry signs are prone to neglect and become eyesores in near future. How many projects that used to have nice water features and stonework now have the water pumps turned off and the rocks are covered with layers of dust and pollution.	concern
164-77	4.3-3	Figure 4.3-1	The existing house locations are not marked on this map. This is required to evaluate the claims in this section.	omission
164-78	4.5-1	Environmental Setting	The types of cars purchased in these up scale neighborhoods and the increased vehicle use by upper middle class neighborhoods was not mentioned in the section. It seems this must be taken into account and was not mentioned.	omission
164-79	4.5-12	4.5I-2	Emissions from charcoal BBQ equipment is not included. These should be studied.	omission
164-80	4.5-13	Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(a)	This mitigation factor is ineffective as this development is high end homes. Who would ride this bus? Nobody. If the EIR is to include this as a mitigating factor then it should also include the likelihood of people actually using this option. My personal opinion, ridership would be extremely low and the pollution from an extremely low ridership bus would be worse than the vehicle traffic it replaces. Not based on fact.	factual
164-81	4.5-13	Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(b)	people in rocklin only ride bicycles for pleasure. The steepness of the hills in the area would be a huge limiting factor in bicycle riding being an acceptable mitigation. This is like saying that bicycle riding in a mountainous town is a viable alternative. Statistics about bicycle use in an upper middle class community would have to be used to justify this alternative. Not based on facts.	factual
164-82	4.5-13	Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(c)	People in high end rocklin homes do not use park and rides. They don't even use public school buses to get their kids to school and back. There are long lines of parents picking up kids at local schools. This is not a realistic mitigation factor for local air pollution. A park and ride would only help to eliminate regional air pollution and not local air pollution. This is not factual.	factual
164-83	4.5-14	Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(d)	Some of these mitigation factors are not enforceable and therefore cannot be used. Placing electrical outlets at the front and rear of houses does not guarantee the home owner will use electric lawn maintenance equipment. Most of these home owners will subcontract yard maintenance and those people all use gas equipment. Providing notice to home buyers for electrical equipment needs to include the percentage of people that would actually do their own maintenance and then the percentage of those that would take advantage of the rebates and results in non-gas operated yard maintenance techniques.	factual

164-84	4.5-14	Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(e)	Some items from Mitigation measure 4.5MM-2(d) should be brought into this measure. Landscaping requirements, use of electric yard maintenance equipment, solar heating or no-heating for pools	modification
164-85	4.6-1	Introduction	What about the impact of increased noise on existing animals with the proposed development area? Where is this covered. I couldn't find it anywhere in the document.	omission
164-86	4.6-1	Project Location	The homes to the east and north are again excluded from the project description.	omission
164-87	4.6-1,18	General Comment	This section reads more like a noise feasibility study for the home owners in the proposed development. There is very little information in this section about the actual impact to existing people and developments. All feasibility information should be removed from the report or referenced in an appendix. Noise feasibility is not an impact. Please remove impacts, 2,3,4,6 and 8 from the document as these are feasibility study type impacts to the home owners in the proposed project.	misleading
164-88	4.6-15	4.6MM-5(b)	Residences should be informed of the blasting schedule. People with PTSD (post traumatic stress disorder) can become very disoriented and potentially violent during this blasting activity.	concern
164-89	4.6-18		No mention of impact to existing residences on the north and east.	omission
164-90	4.6-8	Local	Policy 1, "what are the adopted noise and compatibility guidelines"?	omission
164-91	4.7-12	second paragraph	What is BP? This is never defined.	omission
164-92	4.7-26	Federal Regulations	This section refers to a section 106 review process but the status of this process or the findings of this process are never discussed.	omission
164-93	4.7-28	Archaeological Resources	This section is supposed to summarize and discuss the archaeological resources in the proposed development and how the current set of regulations relate to these resources. Table 4.7-2 should be discussed at length here as to the types of artifacts their age and applicability to the historical record and applicable regulations. The Paleontological sections which I would consider unimportant has 2.5 pages of analysis. The archeological section which is hugely important has a single bullet in less than a half of page. This is a huge omission. Specifically, the site contains a huge amount of obsidian artifacts which are considered rare in this area according to the historical record.	omission
164-94	4.7-31	Consultations	paragraph 2, states that discussions are on-going. Project should not be approved until the discussions are finalized.	concern
164-95	4.7-33	4.7i-1	First sentence is too vague and brief. Need a better summary of what is in violation of regulations that cannot be avoided. Without a list, how can a determination be made as to the relative impact.	omission