

## **2 SUMMARY**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This summary provides an overview of the Rocklin 60 project, which is described in detail in Chapter 3, “Project Description.” This summary also identifies the alternatives to the project, which are described in detail in Chapter 5, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project.” Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter, summarizes the environmental impacts identified for the project in each of the environmental issue sections of this draft environmental impact report (DEIR). These impacts are described in detail throughout Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis.” The summary table at the end of this chapter outlines environmental impacts, the significance without mitigation, proposed mitigation measure(s), and the significance of the impact with implementation of identified mitigation measure/s.

### **2.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The approximately 57-acre project site is located in the City of Rocklin, near the intersection of I-80 and Sierra College Boulevard. The project site consists of undeveloped, vacant lands. The site is immediately southeast of Interstate 80 (I-80) and east of Sierra College Boulevard. Existing retail-commercial and residential land uses exist to the northwest of the project site across Interstate 80 (I-80). Areas south, east, and west of the project site consist of large undeveloped areas interspersed with oak woodlands and rural residences.

The project would result in the development of a total 179 single-family residential units and a storm water detention basin. Chapter 3, “Project Description” provides a more detailed description of the project.

### **2.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Project alternatives are intended to reduce or eliminate the potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project, while attempting to meet the project objectives. An EIR is required to contain a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]).

The following sections summarize the alternatives to the Rocklin 60 project that are addressed in this DEIR. Chapter 5, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project” provides a more detailed description of these alternatives, as well as any alternatives that were originally considered, but then rejected.

#### **2.3.1 THE NO PROJECT: NO DEVELOPMENT**

This alternative assumes that the Rocklin 60 project would not be implemented and that the project site would remain in its current undeveloped state.

#### **2.3.2 THE NO PROJECT: EXISTING GENERAL PLAN**

This alternative assumes that a project would be developed on-site consistent with the Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Retail Commercial, and Recreation/Conservation land use designations specified for the project site in the City’s General Plan.

#### **2.3.3 AVOID CONSTRAINTS BY REMOVING PROPOSED LOTS**

This alternative assumes certain on-site biological resource areas would be avoided and additional buffering from the Secret Ravine area would be provided, while still accommodating approximately 80 to 90 dwelling units on

lots averaging roughly 6,000 to 6,500 square feet in land area. This range of lot sizes is similar to that proposed under the project.

### **2.3.4 AVOID CONSTRAINTS THROUGH CLUSTERING**

This alternative assumes certain on-site biological resource areas would be avoided and additional buffering from the Secret Ravine area would be provided. This alternative assumes that approximately half as much land would be disturbed (compared to the proposed project). This alternative would still involve development of 179 dwelling units, as with the proposed project. However, instead of the roughly 6,000 to 6,500 square foot lots proposed under the project, this alternative would involve subdivision into roughly 3,000 to 3,200 square-foot lots (average).

### **2.3.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative among the alternatives considered be selected and the reasons for such selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts.

For the purpose of this alternatives analysis, the No Project: No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA requires the identification of another environmentally superior alternative when the “no project” alternative is identified as environmentally superior (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[e][2]).

The Avoid Constraints by Removing Proposed Lots Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, setting aside the no project alternative.

## **2.4 SUMMARY OF KNOWN CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

The CEQA Guidelines require that the summary of an EIR include a synopsis of known issues of controversy that have been raised by agencies and the public (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123). A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Rocklin 60 project was released on November 16, 2006. An agency and public scoping session was held on December 7, 2006 to receive oral comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The following is a summary of the most controversial issues that were received during this scoping process:

- ▶ traffic impacts to Dias Lane;
- ▶ air quality impacts from increased traffic;
- ▶ increased storm water runoff causing flooding;
- ▶ water quality of storm water runoff;
- ▶ impacts to existing wildlife;
- ▶ loss of salmon in Secret Ravine;
- ▶ loss of mature oak trees;
- ▶ ability to sufficiently provide law enforcement services;
- ▶ wastewater treatment and flow capacities;
- ▶ light pollution; and,
- ▶ increased traffic generated in project area.

A copy of the NOP and a complete listing of the letters received during the comment periods, including a transcript from the public scoping meeting, are provided in Appendix A.

## 2.5 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Detailed mitigation measures have been identified throughout Chapters 4 and 6 of this report that are intended to mitigate project effects to the extent feasible. All of these mitigation measures are identified in Table 2-1. After implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, most of the adverse effects associated with the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, some impacts would remain significant and unavoidable following the implementation of identified mitigation measures. These impacts include the following:

- ▶ Aesthetics – alteration of visual character (cumulative)
- ▶ Biological Resources – impacts to native oak trees and heritage trees, riparian/wetland habitat, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, special-status fish species, western pond turtle, and special-status birds (cumulative)
- ▶ Aesthetics – alteration of visual character (direct)
- ▶ Biological Resources – impacts to native oak trees and heritage trees – short term (direct)

## 2.6 SUMMARY TABLE

Information in Table 2-1, “Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures,” has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis,” of this document. The summary table is arranged in four columns: environmental impacts; level of significance without mitigation; recommended mitigation measures; and level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures.

A series of mitigation measures are noted when more than one mitigation measure is required to reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level.

## 2.7 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The following provides a summary of the project’s cumulative environmental impacts. A detailed discussion of the project cumulative impacts is provided in Section 6.2, “Cumulative Impacts,” of this EIR.

### 2.7.1 LAND USE

The cumulative development within the region would result in a substantial change in regional land uses, and individual projects would need to be considered in context of their contribution to this change, specifically with respect to whether they physically divide a community or are not consistent with plans and policies adopted with the purpose of avoiding environmental impacts. However, given that the project would not contribute to any significant impacts related to specific CEQA land use issues (division of a community, consistency with plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding environmental impacts), the project would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts in the region. The proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative land use impact.

### 2.7.2 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

#### TRAFFIC OPERATIONS WITHOUT EXTENSION OF DOMINGUEZ ROAD

Without extension of Dominguez Road east to Sierra College Boulevard, the addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at 12 intersections that currently operate

unacceptably. Although these intersections already operate unacceptably, the project's contribution would represent less than a 5 percent increase in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered **less than significant**.

Without extension of Dominguez Road east to Sierra College Boulevard, the proposed project would contribute traffic to four roadway segments that are forecast to operate unsatisfactorily without the project in the cumulative without Dominguez Road scenario. However, a comparison of the no project conditions with the project volume-to-capacity conditions indicates that no change would occur in the three affected roadway segments. As a result, the addition of project traffic is not considered measurable and the impact would be considered **less than significant**.

## **TRAFFIC OPERATIONS WITH EXTENSION OF DOMINGUEZ ROAD**

With extension of Dominguez Road east to Sierra College Boulevard, the addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at seven intersections that currently operate unacceptably. Although these intersections already operate unacceptably, the project's contribution would represent less than a 5 percent increase in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered **less than significant**.

With extension of Dominguez Road east to Sierra College Boulevard, the proposed project would contribute traffic to four roadway segments that are forecast to operate unsatisfactorily without the project in the cumulative with Dominguez Road scenario. However, a comparison of the no project conditions with the project volume-to-capacity conditions indicates that no change would occur in the four affected roadway segments. As a result, the addition of project traffic is not considered measurable and the impact would be considered **less than significant**.

## **FREEWAY INTERCHANGE OPERATIONS**

The proposed project would not degrade the Interstate 80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange during the cumulative scenario. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts on this interchange would be considered **less than significant**.

## **FREEWAY MAINLINE OPERATIONS**

The freeway mainline and ramp junctions would operate acceptably during the cumulative scenario with the addition of project traffic. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts on the freeway mainline would be considered **less than significant**.

## **2.7.3 AIR QUALITY**

### **REGIONAL AIR QUALITY EMISSIONS**

The project would contribute to cumulative regional air pollutant emissions that result in exceedance of air quality standards. This is considered a **significant** impact. However, compliance with PCAPCD-required control measures and incorporation of recommended mitigation measures in this EIR would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative regional air pollutant emissions to a **less-than-significant** level.

### **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Implementation of City policies and mitigation measures would reduce GHG emissions from construction and operation of the project. The implementation of mitigation measures and compliance with City policies would reduce GHG emissions attributable to the project through vehicle emission reductions, vehicular trip reductions, recycling programs, increases in energy efficiency for buildings and appliances, and decreased water use. With

the implementation of these mitigation measures and compliance with City policies, the City has determined that the proposed project would be substantially consistent with the emission reduction strategies contained in the California Climate Action Team’s (CAT) Report to the Governor, the emission reduction recommendations contained in the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) technical advisory entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review, and Executive Order S-3-05. Therefore, the City has determined that the project’s cumulative contribution to climate change impacts would be considered **less than significant**.

## 2.7.4 NOISE

### SHORT-TERM CONSTRUCTION-GENERATED NOISE LEVELS

For the proposed project, adherence to proposed noise mitigation would be sufficient to avoid significant project-specific construction noise impacts. While the construction noise sources associated with reasonably foreseeable future projects could also be considered less than significant for noise impacts, if limited to the daytime hours, there is no guarantee that all the related projects would include such restrictions. Hence, significant cumulative noise impacts associated with construction noise sources could occur. However, because the proposed project would not result in significant construction noise impacts after mitigation and its noise generation would be confined to the site and immediate vicinity, it would not contribute to any such significant cumulative noise impacts. The impact is **less than significant**.

### LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL STATIONARY – AND AREA-SOURCE NOISE LEVELS

Stationary- and area-source noise associated with other related projects could potentially result in exceedence of the applicable noise regulations at proposed receptors; however, because the proposed project would not result in significant stationary- or area-source noise impacts after mitigation, it would not contribute considerably to any such significant cumulative noise impacts. The impact is **less than significant**.

### LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS

While construction and stationary source noise can be controlled onsite at the point of origin, transportation source noise may extend beyond a project site along existing and proposed offsite roadways and result in **significant** traffic noise impacts to sensitive uses along these roadways. The project would result in a slight increase in traffic along area roadways, and an associated slight increase in noise levels under cumulative conditions. However, the project’s incremental contribution to cumulative noise levels would be undetectable by existing and future sensitive receptors and offsite receptors would experience approximately the same noise levels as without the project. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in traffic noise levels, and this cumulative impact is considered **less than significant**.

## 2.7.5 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Population and housing growth throughout the region could lead to significant impacts related to increased housing demand, replacement of housing, and growth inducement. Implementation of the proposed project would increase population in Rocklin from construction of new homes. The project would develop 179 new single-family housing units and add approximately 490 new residents. The project would not induce unplanned growth, increase demand for housing, or create the need for replacement housing. The impact is less than cumulatively considerable and **less than significant**.

## 2.7.6 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

### WATER SUPPLY

Ample surplus water is available over the foreseeable future. Further, no additional water treatment or substantial conveyance facilities would be needed to serve the project. The project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative water supply impact.

### WASTEWATER

Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant provides wastewater treatment facilities for the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD). A project-specific wastewater conveyance system would be constructed, as needed, and would be adequately sized to accommodate only project-related wastewater flows. With operation of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, ample wastewater treatment capacity is available over the foreseeable future. Further, no additional wastewater treatment or conveyance facilities would be needed to serve the project. The project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative wastewater treatment and conveyance impact.

### SOLID WASTE

Cumulative projects would incrementally increase the amount of solid waste generated in the City and disposed of at the Western Regional Landfill. The Western Regional Landfill has long-term available capacity and is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste. The landfill has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards with a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards and a closure date anticipated to be approximately 2036. Therefore, the Western Regional Landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of cumulative projects over the foreseeable future. The project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative solid waste impact.

### ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS

On a cumulative basis, adequate electrical and natural gas facilities and services are available to meet project demands. Further, PG&E would expand their operations on an as needed basis to meet new demands. No expansion of existing facilities would be required for the project. As a result, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative electricity and natural gas impact. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

### FIRE PROTECTION

The proposed project would fully provide for its increment of necessary public services and would not result in a contribution to any cumulative impacts. As stated in Section 4.6, "Utilities and Public Services," of this EIR, no new fire facilities would be required that are not already planned. The project applicant would be required to pay its fair share of costs through payment of the Public Facilities Impact Fees. The City of Rocklin requires new developments to pay impact mitigation fees per dwelling unit (a portion goes to the Fire Department), which would be sufficient to mitigate public service impacts. For these reasons, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to fire protection services. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

The proposed project would fully provide for its increment of necessary public services and would not result in a contribution to any cumulative impacts. As stated in Section 4.6, "Utilities and Public Services," of this EIR, no new police facilities would be required that are not already planned. Funding for department operations comes

from the City's general fund. New police services, including officers and equipment, are funded on an as-needed basis through approval from the City Council. The proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to law enforcement services or police facilities. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

## **SCHOOLS**

The proposed project would fully provide for its increment of necessary public services and would not result in a contribution to any cumulative impacts. As stated in Section 4.6, "Utilities and Public Services," of this EIR, no new school facilities would be required that are not already planned. The project proponent would pay development impact fees sufficient to mitigate school impacts. The proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to school services. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

Development of proposed project with residential uses would add to the cumulative demand for parks and recreation facilities in the City. Development projects are required to pay park and recreation fees as required by the City's subdivision ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code Title 16), which provides for the collection of park and recreation fees and/or parkland dedication for new residential developments at the time properties are subdivided. The fees are used to fund the acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities commensurate with the established parkland standard. Through payment of required fees, the project would not contribute to the cumulative parkland deficit and would satisfy the proposed project's overall park needs and not contribute considerably to any park or recreation related impacts. The project would not contribute to a cumulative impact on parks and recreation facilities. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

## **LIBRARY SERVICES**

The proposed project would increase local demand for library services. Placer County requires development projects to pay a public facilities fee that is collected the time of building permit issuance and is transferred back to Placer County. Through payment of required fees, the project would satisfy the proposed project's overall library needs and not contribute considerably to any library impacts. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to library services. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

### **2.7.7 AESTHETICS**

Implementation of the proposed project would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of vacant, undeveloped lands to developed urban uses, resulting in significant aesthetic impacts. There is no mechanism to allow implementation of the project while avoiding substantial changes in locally available views. Because urban development has occurred along the I-80 corridor, converting formerly open spaces, continued development along the I-80 corridor would be expected to result in a similar aesthetic impacts. The project would considerably contribute to a significant cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, and this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

### **2.7.8 PUBLIC HEALTH AND HAZARDS**

Although no recognized environmental concerns (RECs) have been identified to date on the project site, the site has been used in the past for agricultural activities and on-site surficial soils could contain elevated concentrations of pesticide residuals. It is possible that excavation and construction activities could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; contaminated debris; elevated levels of chemicals that could be hazardous; or, hazardous substances that could be inadvertently spilled or otherwise spread. However, any known or previously undiscovered

contaminated soil or other hazardous materials would be removed from the site in accordance with City and County standards. This would be a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact.

## 2.7.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Any geology and soils related impacts would be confined to the project site. Such impacts would not combine with any geotechnical effects associated with development in other areas. The proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative geology and soils impact.

## 2.7.10 HYDROLOGY, DRAINAGE, AND WATER QUALITY

The project site would not expose future residents to hazards associated with a 100-year flood event, or result in downstream flooding, or result in long-term degradation of water quality (see Section 4.10, Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality”). Cumulative flooding impacts could occur if cumulative projects contributed to additional runoff, resulting in increased erosion or flood hazards. However, the proposed project’s drainage system would capture peak stormwater flows on the site and would not contribute to any cumulative flooding impacts.

The proposed project could contribute cumulatively to the degradation of surface water quality in the region. Implementation of the proposed project could cause short-term water quality degradation associated with construction activities. However, the project will be required to implement measures to prevent the release of pollutants in stormwater off-site, and will be required to minimize erosion of on-site soils. The proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative water quality impact.

## 2.7.11 AGRICULTURE

The project would not convert important farmlands to urban uses and would not conflict with lands zoned for agricultural uses. Therefore, the project would not contribute to an overall or cumulative loss of important farmlands. Thus, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative agricultural resource impact.

## 2.7.12 BIOLOGY

Similar to the proposed project, additional development in the City of Rocklin would potentially result in impacts to native oak trees and heritage trees, riparian/wetland habitat, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, special-status fish species, western pond turtle, and special-status birds. Development in the City of Rocklin in combination with the proposed project would continue to diminish the lands available for biotic resources. These impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12, Biological Resources of this Draft EIR. However, as identified in the EIR for the City of Rocklin General Plan, the impacts on biological resources due to cumulative development within western Placer County would be significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would result in a **significant and unavoidable** cumulative biological resource impact.

## 2.7.13 CULTURAL

Development of related projects described as a part of the cumulative scenario, with which this project is considered, have the potential to result in the discovery of undocumented subsurface cultural resources or unmarked historic-era and prehistoric Native American burials. However, these potential impacts would not increase in severity in consideration of cumulative projects. In addition, the incorporation of standard measures addressing the response when undocumented resources are discovered would address this potential impact. For these reasons, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact on cultural resources.



<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.1 Land Use</b>			
<b>4.1-1 Physically divide an established community.</b> The proposed project would not be expected to physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact on an established community would occur with project implementation.	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.1-2 Consistency with Applicable Plans.</b> The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impacts associated with plan consistency would be anticipated.	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.2 Traffic and Circulation</b>			
<b>4.2-1 Intersections.</b> The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at five intersections that currently operate unacceptably primarily during p.m. peak hours. These intersections already operate unacceptably and the project’s contribution would represent less than a 5 percent increase in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.2-2 Roadway Segments.</b> The proposed project would cause three roadway segments to exceed the threshold of daily capacity. However, in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, the traffic on all three roadway segments is forecast to operate with satisfactory volume/capacity ratios in both peak hours with project conditions. Therefore, the project’s impacts on roadway segments would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.2-3 Right Turns from Croftwood Road. Northbound vehicles exiting from “Croftwood Road” would be required to cross two lanes of traffic.</b> Sufficient gaps in the traffic stream would occur along Sierra College Boulevard to allow right turns from “Croftwood Road” to the northbound through lanes. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.2-4 Bicycle/Pedestrian Circulation Policy Consistency.</b> The proposed project would include design components that are intended to allow safe pedestrian/bicycle access and movement to and through the site consistent with City policies. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.3 Air Quality</b>			
<p><b>4.3-1 Short-Term Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions.</b> The short-term construction-generated emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> would exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 lb/day during the site preparation phase of construction. This is considered a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Short-Term Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions.</b> In accordance with the PCAPCD, the applicant shall comply with all applicable rules and regulations as discussed previously, in addition to implementation of the following recommended mitigation measures during construction of the proposed project (Backus, pers. comm., 2006b).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant shall submit to the City Engineer and PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking. This plan must address the minimum requirements of sections 300 and 400 of Rule 228-Fugitive Dust.</li> <li>2. The applicant shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust emissions exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations.</li> <li>3. Fugitive dust emissions shall not to exceed 40% opacity and shall not go beyond property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations.</li> <li>4. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Rule 202-Visible Emission limitations.</li> <li>5. The project applicant shall ensure compliance with all of PCAPCD's minimum dust requirements.</li> <li>6. Water shall be applied to control fugitive dust, as needed, to prevent impacts offsite. Operational water trucks shall be onsite to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving</li> </ol>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. PCAPCD-approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, shall be applied to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours).</li> <li>8. Soil binders shall be spread on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas, and streets shall be washed (e.g., wet broom) if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares.</li> <li>9. Open burning of any kind shall be prohibited.</li> <li>10. Minimize idling time to five minutes for all diesel-fueled equipment.</li> <li>11. Use ARB diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment.</li> <li>12. The prime contractor shall submit to PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The project representative shall provide PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the project manager and onsite foreman. The project shall provide a plan for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt; 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's website to</li> </ol>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure. <a href="http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/index.shtml#construction">http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/index.shtml#construction</a> .	
<b>4.3-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions.</b> The proposed project would increase criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions in the region, but at a rate below applicable significance thresholds and therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.3-3 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.</b> Given the project's location relative to I-80, implementation of the project would expose sensitive receptors to mobile source air pollutant concentrations - specifically TACs - associated with I-80. This impact is considered significant.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The research documented a reduction in penetration of particulate similar to freeway-generated mobile-source diesel PM through fine-needle tree branches. Therefore, the City has determined that eliminating construction of a residence on Lot 155; the lot closest to the freeway; and using that lot as a tree planting mitigation area, is a feasible mitigation measure. The data available indicate that planting fine-needle evergreen trees on Lot 155 would both enhance the dispersion of emissions from the freeway, and intercept particulate pollutants, including mobile-source diesel PM. To implement this mitigation measure, tiered-tree planting (multiple rows) of a variety of drought-tolerant, fine-needle evergreen trees such as, but not limited to, deodar cedar and redwood, shall be planted (at a minimum size of 15 gallon per tree) within Lot 155 of the project site. In addition, provisions shall be made for a sufficient water supply and necessary site maintenance to ensure establishment and long-term viability of the trees. The trees shall be planted at a density such that a solid visual barrier is achieved once the trees reach maturity, which breaks the line-of-sight between the freeway and the proposed homes.</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.3-4 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions.</b> Because the proposed project is not anticipated to result in or contribute to local CO concentrations that exceed the California 1-hour or 8-hour ambient air quality standards of 20 ppm or 9 ppm, respectively, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.3-5 Creation of, or Exposure to Odorous Emissions.</b> Because the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people or expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.4 Noise</b>			
<p><b>4.4-1 Construction-Generated Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise Levels.</b> Because construction-generated noise levels could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards and/or result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, this impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Construction-Generated Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise Levels.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All construction equipment shall be properly equipped with feasible noise control devices (e.g., mufflers) and properly maintained in good working order.</li> <li>2. Construction activities shall be limited to the less noise sensitive daytime hours (7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. on weekends).</li> <li>3. An on-site Noise Coordinator (as a function of on-site project management) shall be employed by the applicant, and his or her telephone number along with instructions on how to file a noise complaint shall be posted conspicuously around the project site during all project construction phases. The Noise Coordinator’s duties shall include fielding and documenting noise complaints, determining the source of the complaint (e.g., piece of construction equipment), determining whether noise levels at the project boundary are within acceptable limits (i.e., the performance standards in Table 4.4-6), and reporting complaints to the City with documented noise levels at the time of complaint. The Noise Coordinator shall work, to the extent feasible, with the surrounding residents and</li> </ol>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>project contractors to schedule activities to minimize disturbance of residents during the daytime hours.</p> <p>4. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with the improvements, the contractor shall conduct the blasting activities in compliance with state and local regulations. The contractor shall obtain a blasting permit from the City of Rocklin prior to commencing any on-site blasting activities. The permit application shall include a description of the work to be accomplished and a statement of the necessity for blasting, as opposed to other methods, including avoidance of hard rock areas. The permit application shall also specify safety measures to be implemented, such as use of blast blankets. The contractor shall coordinate any blasting activities with the Rocklin Police and Fire Departments to ensure proper site access and traffic control, and to ensure proper public notification, including media, nearby residents and businesses, as determined appropriate by the Rocklin Police Department. Blasting specifications and plans shall include a schedule that outlines the time frame during which blasting will occur in order to limit noise and traffic inconvenience.</p>	
<p><b>4.4-2 Traffic-Generated Permanent Increases in Ambient Noise Levels.</b> The proposed project would not result in a noticeable increase in traffic noise levels at off-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.4-3 Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels.</b> Because the project could expose proposed noise sensitive uses to noise in exceedance of City standards (i.e., 60 dBA Ldn or CNEL), this impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels.</b></p> <p>1. Noise Barrier</p> <p>a. A noise barrier ranging in height from 9 to 11 feet shall be constructed along the property line to achieve conditionally-acceptable future traffic noise levels of 60–65 dBA Ldn for residences within the 60 dBA noise contour</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>on the project site.</p> <p>b. Barriers shall be constructed of concrete or masonry block, or precast concrete. Barriers on top of earthen berms are also acceptable. Other prefabricated barriers may be used; however, they shall be reviewed by an acoustical consultant.</p> <p>c. The recommended noise barrier shall traverse across the northern end of Buttonbush Lane, to be opened later to allow future access to other developments to the north, should such developments be approved. It would not be feasible to achieve the required noise attenuation for this project without closing this gap with some additional noise barrier, as the opening would create a substantial acoustic “leak” into the development. However, additional noise mitigation measures are assumed to be necessary for any future development located to the north, including the likely construction of a noise wall along I-80. The opening at Wedgeleaf Drive with the recommended noise barrier design wrap, would not result in a noticeable acoustical leak because of the distance and angle of construction to I-80. A combined Fire and Pedestrian Access opening is to be located behind Building G of the adjacent approved retail center (Rocklin Crossings). With the combination of distance from the Fire and Pedestrian Access opening to the nearest homes and the additional shielding provided by the retail center, the traffic noise levels associated with I-80 will comply with the City’s exterior noise standard at outdoor activity areas of proposed sensitive receptors.</p> <p>2. Sound Insulation</p> <p>a. To achieve compliance with the 45 dBA Ldn interior noise level standard at elevated second floor facades, an exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 33 dBA would be required. Building facade and window assembly upgrades would be required of this project. It is likely that window ratings will need to be upgraded to a combination of STC-35 and STC-</p>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>38 rated windows, depending on the ratio of exposed windows with a full or partial view of I-80 to solid building facades. An analysis of project construction plans should be conducted when such plans are available to ensure that sufficient sound insulation has been incorporated into the project design. In addition, the project applicant shall implement the following measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ All residential buildings shall be constructed with mechanical ventilation systems which would allow occupants to keep windows and doors closed to achieve acoustical isolation from I-80 traffic noise. The systems shall allow for the introduction of fresh outside air, without the requirement of open windows.</li> <li>▶ All attic vents in the residential buildings on lots along the northern boundary of the site shall be acoustically baffled. The baffles shall introduce at least one 90 degree obstruction to the flow of air through the vent. The baffle shall be lined with an acoustically absorbent material.</li> <li>▶ The project applicant shall be required to submit an analysis that verifies compliance with the City of Rocklin 45 dBA Ldn interior noise level standard for the residential buildings within the 60 dBA noise contour of I-80 (distance to be determined after mitigation has been implemented [i.e., accounting for the actual attenuation achieved from the noise barrier constructed along the northern project boundary]). The analysis shall be based upon actual building plans and shall be conducted before the issuance of building permits for these units. The analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant.</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable



<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.4-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Stationary- or Area-Source Noise Levels.</b> The mechanical equipment and truck deliveries associated with adjacent proposed commercial uses would generate substantial noise levels, which could affect the proposed residential uses of the Rocklin 60 project. However, the Rocklin Crossings project is required to reduce noise levels for the adjacent residences to acceptable levels. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.4-5 Exposure of Sensitive Uses to Excessive Vibration Levels.</b> The proposed project would generate vibration levels that could cause annoyance for existing adjacent residential uses. However, such instances of construction vibration would be temporary and intermittent in nature and no long-term sources of vibration would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.4-6 Exposure of Sensitive Uses to Excessive Aircraft-Generated Noise Levels.</b> The project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive aircraft noise, and thus, no impact would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	NI
<b>4.5 Population and Housing</b>			
<p><b>4.5-1 Increase in Housing Demand during Construction.</b> Project implementation would increase construction employment within the City of Rocklin for the duration of the project's construction activities. Because an adequate labor force is available in the local region, this temporary increase in employment would not be expected to substantially increase the local demand for housing. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.5-2 Increased Population Growth.</b> The project would directly accommodate population growth in the City. However, the introduction of an additional 490 residents associated with</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>project implementation would not be expected to create permanent employment growth nor would it be expected to cause other development that would result in significant adverse environmental impacts. The impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
<b>4.6 Utilities and Public Services</b>			
<p><b>4.6-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, and Conveyance Facilities.</b> The PCWA would provide water service to the project site project site and would be served by the Foothill WTP. The project applicant would pay all PCWA required fees and charges for water service. Sufficient water supplies, water treatment capacity, and conveyance infrastructure are available to serve the project. This impact would be a less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.6-2 Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Facilities.</b> Implementation of the project would increase demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities. Existing wastewater treatment facilities and the planned wastewater conveyance facilities currently under construction would be adequate to serve the project. This impact is would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.6-3 Increased Generation of Solid Waste.</b> The proposed project would incrementally increase the amount of solid waste generated in the City. However, the Western Regional Landfill, which would receive solid waste from the project, has long-term available capacity. Therefore, the project’s impacts on solid waste disposal is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.6-4 Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure. PG&amp;E would be able to provide electricity to the project site. Because the proposed electrical utility improvements would be required to comply with all</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
existing City, PG&E, and CPUC requirements, and applicable Uniform Building Code requirements, it is anticipated that the proposed electrical utility improvements would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.			
<b>4.6-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for natural gas. PG&E would provide natural gas to the project site. Proposed natural gas infrastructure would be required to comply with all existing City and PG&E requirements. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.6-6 Required Extension of Telecommunications Services.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would require extension of existing telecommunication services. AT&T and Wave Broadband Services would provide telephone and cable services, respectively, to the project site and upgrade existing facilities, as necessary, to serve the project. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.6-7 Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.</b> Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities and services. Because project designs would incorporate all Rocklin Fire Department and Uniform Fire Code requirements, and project applicant would be required to pay their fair share of costs through payment of the Public Facilities Impact Fees, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.6-8 Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.</b> Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for police protection facilities and services. The City would add personnel to the police department on an as-needed basis to meet service goals, and no new police facilities to serve the project would be	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
required. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.			
<b>4.6-9 Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services.</b> Development of the proposed project would generate new students in the Loomis Union School District and Placer Union High School District. The project would be subject to development impact fees which would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts. As a result, the project would have in less-than-significant impacts on school services and facilities.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.6-10 Increased Demand for Parks and Recreation Facilities.</b> Development of proposed project with residential uses would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities in the City. The applicant would pay park and recreation fees as required by the City’s subdivision ordinance, and therefore the project would have less-than-significant impacts on parks and recreation facilities.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.6-11 Increased Demand for Library Services.</b> The proposed project would result in increased demand for library services. Because the project applicant would pay the Placer County public facilities fees, impacts on library services would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.7 Aesthetics</b>			
<b>4.7-1 Impacts on Scenic Vistas.</b> Views on or near the project site are not considered scenic vistas. Therefore, development of the project site would not alter or obscure a scenic vista. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.7-2 Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway.</b> The project site is not visible from a State Scenic Highway and would not damage scenic resources. The project would result in no impacts to scenic resources within a scenic	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	NI

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
highway.			
<b>4.7-3 Change in Visual Character.</b> The project would convert views of an approximately 57-acre oak woodland/grassland landscape to urban development. This would substantially alter the visual character of the project area. This would represent a significant and unavoidable impact to the visual character of the area.	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU
<b>4.7-4 Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces.</b> The project would require lighting of new development and could construct facilities with reflective surfaces that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on I-80 and Sierra College Boulevard under day and nighttime conditions. In addition, the degree of darkness in the City of Rocklin and on the project site would diminish as a result of development, potentially diminishing views of stars and other features of the night sky. This impact is considered significant.	S	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.7-4: Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces.</b> ▶ All exterior street light fixtures shall be aimed downward and shall be shielded to prevent light spillage onto adjoining properties.	LTS
<b>4.8 Public Health and Hazards</b>			
<b>4.8-1 Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and the General Public.</b> No recognized environmental hazards have been identified to date on the project site; however, the site has been used in the past for agricultural activities and onsite surficial soils could contain elevated concentrations of pesticide residuals. Excavation and construction activities in the area could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; contaminated debris; elevated levels of chemicals that could be hazardous; or, hazardous substances that could be inadvertently spilled or otherwise spread. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1: Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and the General Public.</b> a. If during site preparation and construction activities previous undiscovered or unknown evidence of hazardous materials contamination is observed or suspected through either obvious or implied measures (e.g., stained or odorous soil, unknown storage tanks), construction activities shall immediately cease within 100 feet of the find.  The City of Rocklin and the Placer County Environmental Health Department staff shall be immediately consulted, and the project applicant shall contract with a qualified consultant registered in DTSC's Registered Environmental Assessor Program to assess the situation. If necessary, risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent. Any required remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Work Plan or equivalent. Based on consultation between the Registered Environmental Assessor and DTSC, remediation of the site shall be conducted consistent with all applicable regulations. Any necessary remediation of the site shall be to the satisfaction of the City of Rocklin and the Placer County Environmental Health Department.</p> <p>b. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall contact a qualified environmental professional registered in DTSC’s Registered Environmental Assessor Program to determine the extent to which soils at the site have been adversely affected by past agricultural activities. Soil samples and analysis shall be conducted using standard protocols provided in the State Department of Toxic Substances Control’s Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Site, and/or ESA and other appropriate testing guidelines to determine if concentrations of organochlorine pesticides exceeded the preliminary remediation goals established for that compound. If necessary, risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent. Any required remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Work Plan or equivalent. Any necessary remediation of the site shall be in accordance with the recommendations of a qualified consultant registered in DTSC’s Registered Environmental Assessor Program and consistent with all applicable regulations. Remediation of the site shall be to the satisfaction of the City of Rocklin and the Placer County Environmental Health Department.</p> <p>c. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities on the site, the water pump house containing a water pressure holding tank and concrete cistern shall be removed in accordance with the recommendations of a qualified consultant registered in DTSC’s Registered Environmental Assessor Program. Removal of these structures shall be to the satisfaction of the City of Rocklin and the Placer County Environmental Health</p>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Department.</p> <p>d. If, during site preparation and construction activities, previous undiscovered or unknown water supply, agricultural, or hand-dug wells are uncovered, each shall require abandonment and/or removal in accordance with the recommendations of a qualified consultant registered in DTSC's Registered Environmental Assessor Program, and according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23 and in coordination with the Placer County Environmental Health Department well abandonment procedure. Confirmation of the abandonment shall be submitted to the Placer County Environmental Health Department and City of Rocklin.</p> <p>e. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall provide to the City of Rocklin an assessment conducted by or on behalf of PG&amp;E pertaining to the contents of the existing pole mounted transformers located on and nearby the project site. The assessment shall determine whether existing electrical transformers on the site contain PCBs and whether there are any records of spills from such equipment. If PCB containing equipment is identified, the maintenance and/or disposal of the transformer shall be subject to the regulations of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) under the authority of the Placer County Environmental Health Department. If no PCB-containing equipment is found, they shall be labeled as such and no further mitigation would be required.</p>	
<p><b>4.8-2 Create a Significant Hazard to Construction Workers and the General Public through the Use of Hazardous Materials.</b> The proposed project would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations, which would be monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, would reduce impacts associated with the use, transport, and storage of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
hazardous materials during construction. In addition, residents would not be expected to use significant quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts related to creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment would be less than significant.			
<p><b>4.8-3 Potential for Public Health Hazards from Mosquitoes Associated with the Onsite Detention Basin.</b> The proposed project would include an onsite detention basin, which could attract mosquitoes and other water-borne vectors, thereby potentially creating a public health hazard. The detention basin would be adequately sized to attenuate the post-project peak flows without creating standing water that could facilitate mosquito breeding. In addition, the Placer Mosquito Abatement District would conduct mosquito abatement activities within the project site, as necessary. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.8-4 Exposure of People or Structures to Wildfire Fires.</b> The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area, a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a SRA area. However, the proposed project would introduce residential land uses adjacent to open spaces along Secret Ravine Creek, which could potentially restrict access to open space areas for fire suppression and fuels management and create additional fire hazards, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8-4: Exposure of People or Structures to Wildfire Fires.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prior to approval of the tentative subdivision map, the project applicant shall fund a fire modification/fuel prevention plan for residences adjacent to wildland areas. The fire modification/fuel prevention plan shall include a fuels management plan, and recommend building separations and distances from wildland areas, evacuation and access routes, fire safety zones, and maintenance. The plan is subject to approval by the Rocklin Fire Department.</li> <li>b. Development and subdivision design shall include adequate setbacks, as determined by the Rocklin Fire Department, between open space/corridor areas and structures. Fire pre-suppression and suppression access easements to open space areas shall be required, as deemed appropriate by the Rocklin Fire Department, as part of the subdivision map process prior to approval of any tentative subdivision map. Six-foot wide fire access easements to the open space areas shall be</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable



<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>provided between structures at a minimum of every 500 feet.</p> <p>c. Plans shall clearly identify points of public ingress / egress to the satisfaction of the City of Rocklin Fire Department.</p>	
<b>4.9 Geology and Soils</b>			
<p><b>4.9-1 Risks to People and Structures Caused by Seismic Hazards, Including Strong Seismic Ground Shaking.</b> The project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone as designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act, and no known faults are located on the project site. Based on the site topography, soil profiles, and the groundwater table, the potential for soil expansion, slope instability/failure, and liquefaction was determined to be low. However, ground shaking, as a result of seismic activity from nearby or distant earthquake faults, could cause seismic-related ground failure. Thus, development of the project site for residential uses has the potential to expose people to adverse effects from seismic hazards, including strong seismic ground shaking. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.9-1: Risks to People and Structures Caused by Seismic Hazards, Including Strong Seismic Ground Shaking.</b></p> <p>a. Before issuance of a grading permit, the approved project design plans and specifications, including grading and foundation plans, shall be reviewed by a qualified geotechnical engineer approved by the City. This review shall be completed to assess the extent to which the recommendations in the preliminary geotechnical report are appropriate and sufficient for construction of the buildings described in the final project design plans.</p> <p>b. During project design and construction, all recommendations outlined in the preliminary geotechnical report for the project (Wallace Kuhl &amp; Associates 2006) shall be implemented, at the direction of the City engineer, to prevent significant impacts associated with seismic activity. A geotechnical engineer shall be present on-site during earthmoving activities to ensure that requirements outlined in the geotechnical reports are adhered to for proper fill and compaction of soils.</p> <p>c. Should the construction schedule require continued work during the wet weather months (e.g., October through April), the project applicant shall consult with a qualified civil engineer and implement any additional recommendations provided, as conditions warrant. These recommendations would include but not be limited to (1) allowing a prolonged drying period before attempting grading operations at any time after the onset of winter rains; and (2) implementing aeration or lime treatment, to allow any low-permeability surface clay soils intended for use as engineered fill to reach a moisture content that would permit the specified degree of compaction to be achieved</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
(Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2006).			
<p><b>4.9-2 Construction-Related Erosion Hazards.</b> Construction activities associated with project site development could result in localized erosion during storm events. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Construction-Related Erosion Hazards.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A grading and erosion control plan shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer retained by the applicant(s) and submitted to the City of Rocklin Engineering Department for approval prior to issuance of grading permits. The plan shall comply with the California Building Standards Code grading requirements, the City of Rocklin Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control (Municipal Code Title 15, Chapter 15.28), and erosion control recommendations in the project’s geotechnical report (Wallace Kuhl &amp; Associates 2006). The plan shall identify the specific grading proposed for the new development. All grading shall be balanced on-site, where feasible.</li> <li>b. To ensure grading activities do not directly or indirectly discharge sediments into surface waters as a result of construction activities, the project applicant shall develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall identify BMPs that would be used to protect stormwater runoff and minimize erosion during construction.</li> <li>c. The project applicant shall prepare plans to control erosion and sediment, shall prepare preliminary and final grading plans, and shall prepare plans to control urban runoff from the project site during construction, in compliance with the City of Rocklin Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control (Municipal Code Title 15, Chapter 15.28) and the erosion control recommendations in the project’s geotechnical report (Wallace Kuhl &amp; Associates 2006).</li> </ul>	LTS
<b>4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<p><b>4.10-1 Increased Runoff and Potential for Localized or Downstream Flooding.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces on the project</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>site, which would lead to an increase in stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. The increased surface runoff could result in a greater potential for on-site and off-site flooding. The proposed project includes a stormwater runoff collection and detention system pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the Stormwater Management Manual that would be sufficient to attenuate the post-project peak flows to pre-project peak levels. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
<p><b>4.10-2 Exposure of Future Residents to Hazards Associated with a 100-Year Flood.</b> The southeastern portion of the project site along Secret Ravine Creek is designated as a 100-year floodplain. All residential parcels would be located outside the existing 100-year floodplain and the area between the proposed residential parcels and Secret Ravine Creek would remain as open space. The development of the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or place housing that would impede or redirect flows within a 100-year flood hazard area. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.10-3 Potential for Short-Term Construction-Related Soil Erosion and Water Quality Impairment.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could cause short-term water quality degradation associated with construction activities. Construction activities (grading, excavation, etc.) could generate sediment, erosion, and other nonpoint source pollutants in on-site stormwater, which could drain to off-site areas, potentially degrading local water quality. Further, areas of exposed or stockpiled soils could be subject to sheet erosion during rain events. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.10-3: Potential for Short-Term Construction-Related Soil Erosion and Water Quality Impairment.</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall demonstrate compliance, through its erosion-controlled SWPPP, with all requirements of the City’s Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Title 8, Chapter 8.30 of the City Code) and the Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Title 15, Chapter 15.28 of the City Code), which regulate stormwater and prohibit non-stormwater discharges except where regulated by an NPDES permit. This includes preparing erosion, sediment, and pollution control plans for each construction phase and post-construction, if necessary. The project’s grading plans shall be approved by the City of Rocklin, Engineering Department prior to the initiation of site grading activities.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The project applicant shall implement measures including the use of soil stabilizers, fiber rolls, inlet filters, and gravel bags to prevent pollutants from being carried off-site in stormwater generated on the project site. These measures shall be designed to accommodate stormwater and non-stormwater discharges associated with proposed measures that would be implemented to control on-site dust generation (e.g., wheel washing, active watering).</li> <li>c. Prior to issuance of grading permit or any construction activity, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB the appropriate regulatory approvals for project construction including a Section 401 water quality certification, and an NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, including construction dewatering activities.</li> <li>d. As required under the NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, the project applicant shall prepare and submit the appropriate Notice of Intent and prepare the SWPPP and the erosion control plan for pollution prevention and control prior to initiating site construction activities. The SWPPP and other appropriate plans shall identify and specify the use of erosion sediment control BMPs, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, nonstormwater management controls, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities. The SWPPP shall also specify the pollutants that are likely to be used during construction and that could be present in stormwater drainage and nonstormwater discharges. A sampling and monitoring program shall be included in the SWPPP that meets the requirements of SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ to ensure the BMPs are effective.</li> <li>e. Construction techniques shall be identified that would reduce the potential runoff and the SWPPP shall identify the erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented. The SWPPP shall also specify spill prevention and contingency</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		measures, identify the types of materials used for equipment operation, and identify measures to prevent or clean up spills of hazardous materials used for equipment operation and hazardous waste. Emergency procedures for responding to spills shall also be identified. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be used in subsequent site development activities. The SWPPP shall identify personnel training requirements and procedures that would be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation and performance inspection methods for BMPs specified in the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall also identify the appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP. All construction contractors shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site.	
<p><b>4.10-4 Potential Long-Term Degradation of Water Quality.</b> The proposed project would convert land that is currently undeveloped to residential uses and thereby change the amount and timing of potential waste discharges in stormwater runoff. The potential water quality degradation associated with site operations would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.10-4: Potential Long-Term Degradation of Water Quality.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Before issuance of a grading permit for the site, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB a general NPDES permit and shall comply with all of the permit requirements in order to minimize storm water discharges associated with site operations. In addition, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP and implement Best Management Practices designed to minimize sedimentation and release of products used during site operations.</li> <li>b. Before approval of the final project design, the project applicant shall identify storm water runoff BMPs selected from the Storm Water Quality Task Force’s California Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook (American Public Works Association 1993), the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association’s (1999) Start at the Source: Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection, or similar documents.</li> <li>c. Typical BMPs that could be used on the project site shall</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		include, but are not limited to, catchbasin inserts, compost storm water filters, sand filters, vegetated filter strips, biofiltration swales, oil/water separators, bioretention basins, or other equally effective measures. Other BMPs shall include, but would not be limited to, administrative controls such as signage at inlets to prevent illicit discharges into storm drains, parking lot and other pavement area sweeping, public education, and hazardous waste management and disposal programs. BMPs shall identify and implement mechanisms for the routine maintenance, inspection, and repair of pollution control mechanisms. In addition, the BMPs shall be reviewed for adequacy by the City of Rocklin, Engineering Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the site to ensure that they will effectively remove pollutants from the site's stormwater runoff.	
<b>4.11 Agriculture</b>			
<b>4.11-1 Conversion of Important Farmlands.</b> The project would not convert important farmlands to non-agricultural land uses and would not conflict with lands zoned for agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact on agricultural resources would be anticipated with project implementation.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.11-2 Conflict with Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts.</b> The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract and the project site is not zoned for agricultural land uses. Therefore, development of the project site as proposed would not result in any conflicts with Williamson Act contracts or agricultural zoning designations and no impact would result.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>4.11-3 Conflict with Offsite Agricultural Operations.</b> The project site is not located adjacent to agricultural operations and development of the project site would not result in conflicts between any agricultural activities and proposed residential land uses, which could lead to the abandonment of agricultural operations and ultimate conversion of this land to non-	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
agricultural land uses. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.			
<b>4.12 Biological Resources</b>			
<p><b>4.12-1 Effects on Federally Protected Waters of the United States.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in loss of nearly 5 acres of features that qualify for USACE jurisdiction. This impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-1: Federally Protected Waters of the United States.</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall mitigate for impacts to waters of the United States resulting from project development by implementing the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project applicant shall develop and implement a mitigation plan to address protection of wetland features retained onsite and compensate for unavoidable loss of wetlands. Compensation shall ensure through creation and/or enhancement of appropriate wetland habitats that there is no net loss of overall functions and values of the wetland habitat types adversely affected by the proposed project. The amount of wetland habitat to be included in the mitigation site shall be based on the value of the proposed compensation action and the nature of the effects, but a minimum of a 1:1 ratio of adversely affected habitat to mitigation habitat shall be provided. Compensation may be provided at a ratio of 1:1 of created habitat to filled habitat, while a higher mitigation ratio may be appropriate for mitigation through enhancement and a lower mitigation ratio may be appropriate for indirect effects to habitat preserved on-site.</li> <li>b. The mitigation plan shall, at a minimum, identify the location of the mitigation site; specify habitat types and associated acreages to created or enhanced; establish specific success criteria, describe short- and long-term maintenance and management of the mitigation site and wetland habitats preserved onsite; and specify remedial measures to be undertaken if mitigation success criteria are not met.</li> <li>c. Off-site mitigation shall be implemented within Placer County, or a suitable adjacent county, at a location that would provide at least equal-quality wetland habitat to that of the</li> </ul>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>project site after implementation of the mitigation.</p> <p>d. Long-term protection of the mitigation site and on-site preserved wetlands shall be ensured through fee title acquisition, conservation easement, or other suitable mechanisms. Long-term management of mitigation lands shall be ensured by establishing a management endowment or other suitable funding source.</p> <p>e. The mitigation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the applicable resource agencies and applicable permits, including a Section 404 permit from the USACE and Section 401 Clean Water Certification from the RWQCB shall be obtained prior to project implementation.</p> <p>f. As an alternative to creating and preserving wetland and waters, equivalent mitigation credits may be purchased in a mitigation bank for impacts on seasonal wetlands and waters of the United States. Purchase of credits in a mitigation bank shall be subject to approval by permitting agencies and the City. The project applicant shall prepare a mitigation plan that provides detailed information about the bank. Mitigation credits must be verified by the permitting agencies and the City prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities on the project site.</p>	
<p><b>4.12-2 Impacts on Native Oak Trees and Heritage Trees – Short Term.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in loss of 843 native oak trees protected under the City of Rocklin’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, including 11 heritage trees. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-2: Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees - Short Term.</b></p> <p>The total trunk diameter inches to be removed by the project was calculated during the 2007 tree survey to be 10,651 inches. This number of total inches will be used to implement the following measures to mitigate for the loss of protected trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Prior to the initiation of site grading activities, the project shall obtain an oak tree removal permit from the City of Rocklin;</li> <li>▶ The project applicant shall develop and implement a mitigation plan that will satisfy the City of Rocklin’s required mitigation criteria; the mitigation plan shall be developed according to the requirements of the Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance,</li> </ul>	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site mitigation through native oak tree replacement is the preferred mitigation method based on the City’s ordinance;</li> <li>• The mitigation plan shall provide a 2:1 replacement of protected trees (as calculated on an inch-for-inch replacement ratio basis) that will be removed;</li> <li>• If mitigation cannot occur on the site, replacement planting shall occur on a site determined by the City of Rocklin to be suitable for mitigation. The location and condition under which replacement trees are planted must be carefully selected to allow for practicable and feasible future development to minimize the likelihood that future tree removal is not required, and to maximize the likelihood that the replacement trees will survive and thrive;</li> <li>• The ideal age and size of a replacement tree shall be as specified in the City’s ordinance;</li> <li>• Transplanted trees, whether from on the site or off-site, may be accepted as replacement trees, but shall be given a discounted value, as specified in the City’s ordinance, based on anticipated survival rates, as compared with nursery stock. The discounted value specified in the City’s ordinance shall be reviewed from time to time;</li> <li>• Any replacement tree, including a transplanted tree, which dies within five years of being planted must be replaced on a one-to-one basis;</li> <li>• Where mitigation formulas use percentages, results will always be rounded up to the next whole number percentage. (Ordinance 676, Section 8 (in part)).</li> </ul> <p>► The project applicant shall provide maintenance and monitoring for replacement trees according to the City of Rocklin’s permit conditions; and</p> <p>Payment of an in-lieu fee per tree into the City of Rocklin’s Tree Preservation Fund may be considered as an alternative mitigation measure. If implemented, the in-lieu payments will be based on</p>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		the required number of replacement trees, as identified in the following formula: The Discount Diameter equals 20% of the total DBH for all surveyed trees on the site. The total DBH of all surveyed trees on the site to be removed minus the Discount Diameter equals the required total DBH (in inches) of replacement trees. In no event shall the number of replacement trees be less than twice the number of trees removed (two to one).	
<b>4.12-3 Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees – Long Term.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of all of 843 native oak trees on the site, including 11 heritage trees. This impact would be considered potentially significant in the long-term.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-3: Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees - Long Term.</b> ▶ Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-2: Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees.	LTS
<b>4.12-4 Impacts on Sensitive Natural Communities, including Oak Woodland.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in loss of nearly 5 acres of waters of the United States and approximately 20 acres of oak woodland. This impact would be significant.	S	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-4: Impacts on Sensitive Natural Communities, including Oak Woodland.</b> ▶ Implement Mitigation Measures 4.12-1 and 4.12-2.	LTS
<b>4.12-5 Impacts on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in loss of up to 35 blue elderberry shrubs, which provide potential habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. This impact is potentially significant.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-5: Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.</b> The project applicant shall comply with the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion issued by USFWS on June 1, 2007: a. Elderberry shrubs that are not within the footprint of proposed residential lots or street alignments shall be preserved in place. A minimum of a 20-foot buffer from the dripline of each retained shrub shall be established to ensure that beetles that may be utilizing the shrubs are not adversely affected. All buffers shall be marked with brightly colored flags or fencing and shall be maintained until project construction is complete. b. The 35 elderberry shrubs located onsite will be transplanted to a Service-approved valley elderberry longhorn beetle conservation bank in accordance with the Service’s 1999 Conservation Guidelines.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. The project applicant will purchase credits sufficient to plant 62 elderberry shrub seedlings and 62 associated riparian native species at a Service-approved valley elderberry longhorn beetle conservation bank. These numbers are the proposed compensation ratios in accordance with the Service’s 1999 Conservation Guidelines.</li> <li>e. The created beetle habitat will be monitored in accordance with the Service’s 1999 Conservation Guidelines.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.12-6 Impacts on Special-Status Fish Species.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in degradation of habitat for special-status fish within Secret Ravine. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-6: Impacts on Special-Status Fish Species.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-3 and 4.10-4 identified in Section 4.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” of this EIR.</li> </ul>	LTS
<p><b>4.12-7 Impacts on California Red-Legged Frog.</b> California red-legged frog is unlikely to occur on or in the vicinity of the project site and would not be affected by the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.12-8 Impacts on Western Pond Turtle.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in injury or death of western pond turtles if present in aquatic features to be filled on the project site. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-8: Western Pond Turtle.</b></p> <p>The following shall be implemented to mitigate adverse effects to western pond turtle potentially resulting from the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ To minimize potential injury or death of pond turtles during project construction, a qualified biologist approved by the City shall conduct surveys in aquatic habitats to be dewatered and/or filled during project construction or grading of aquatic habitat.</li> <li>▶ Surveys shall be conducted immediately after any dewatering and before any fill of aquatic habitat. If no pond turtles are found, no mitigation will be required. If pond turtles are found, the biologist shall capture them and move them to suitable habitat in Secret Ravine.</li> </ul>	LTS
<p><b>4.12-9 Disturbance of Burrowing Owl Habitat.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
adversely affect burrowing owls because it is rare to find them nesting in the foothills as far east as the project site and there are no documented records of burrowing owls within five miles of the project area.			
<b>4.12-10 Disturbance of Raptors and Migratory Birds.</b> Loss of nests of special-status species would result in substantial adverse effects to local populations.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-10: Disturbance of Raptors and Migratory Birds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Removal of nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds shall be timed to avoid the nesting season.</li> <li>b. If vegetation removal and/or project construction occurs during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds, preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by the City. The surveys shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be conducted within 14 days prior to commencement of project activity. The surveys shall be valid for one construction season. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required.</li> <li>c. If active nests are found, impacts shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the nest is no longer active. DFG guidelines recommend implementation of 500 foot buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines through consultation with CDFG and/or USFWS that construction activities would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist may be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.</li> </ul>	LTS
<b>4.12-11 Impacts on California Black Rail.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in the disturbance of habitat and loss of active nests of California black rail. This impact would be significant.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12-11: Impacts on California Black Rail.</b></p> <p>The following shall be implemented to mitigate adverse effects to California black rail that may result from the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prior to the start of construction, surveys for California black</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>rail shall be conducted by a qualified biologist experienced with this species. Surveys shall be conducted to determine presence and should be conducted during breeding season (late February through late July). Surveys shall be conducted during peak calling times (one half hour before dawn until three hours after, and three hours before sunset until one half hour after) using playback of taped breeding calls. The surveys shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity, and shall concentrate on all shallow water areas (less than 3cm in depth) or muddy areas with a dense cover of emergent vegetation. Trampling through the marsh vegetation shall be minimized to avoid potential for destruction of nests. Surveys shall be conducted within 14 days prior to commencement of project activity.</p> <p>b. If black rail is not detected after three site visits (including at least one morning and one evening survey), then no further mitigation shall be required.</p> <p>c. If black rail is detected, impacts shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the species has evacuated the area. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist and confirmed by DFG; buffer size may vary, depending on the nest location, nest stage, and construction activity.</p> <p>d. If black rail is detected, mitigation for loss of federally protected waters of the United States (Mitigation Measure 4.12-1) shall include, at a minimum ratio of 1:1, wetland habitat suitable for use by and within the Sierra Foothill range of the species.</p>	
<b>4.13 Cultural Resources</b>			
<b>4.13-1 Impacts to Significant Documented Cultural Resources.</b> One significant cultural resource site could be adversely impacted by implementation of the project. This is a	S	<b>Mitigation Measure 4.13-1: Impacts to Significant Documented Cultural Resources.</b> ▶ Two main options for mitigating the project's impacts on	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
significant impact.		<p>cultural resource CA-Pla-1220 are available: (1) resource avoidance or (2) data recovery. Resource avoidance includes specifically defining the non-disturbance area, redesigning the project to avoid all ground disturbances within this non-disturbance area and establishing long-term access restrictions (e.g., fencing, deed restrictions) that will preclude disturbance and maintain the site's integrity and data potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The second option, data recovery, involves the recovery and documentation of data from the site, extensive contiguous block unit excavations, the analysis of recovered archaeological materials, and documentation of the data recovery program according to State of California and federal guidelines. If implemented, this option shall include a detailed data recovery program that results in the documentation of the important scientific information contained in the site and provides this data in a format available for review and use by the cultural resources management and academic archaeological fields. The recovery program shall include contiguous block excavations designed to uncover traces of prehistoric activity at the site. These specific activities and traces could include human interments, fire hearths, sustenance resource processing and storage facilities and implements, food remains, and debitage from stone tool production. The recovery of materials suitable for absolute dating techniques such as obsidian appropriate for hydration analysis, or charcoal or other faunal materials for radio-carbon dating shall also be a primary focus of a data recovery program.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.13-2 Impacts to Undocumented Cultural Resources.</b> The possibility exists that previously undiscovered and undocumented resources could be adversely affected or otherwise altered by ground disturbing activities during project construction. Disturbance of undocumented resources would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.13-2: Impacts to Undocumented Cultural Resources.</b></p> <p>If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological 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 could include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts.	
<b>4.13-3 Potential to Uncover Human Remains.</b> Subsurface disturbances associated with construction activities could potentially uncover unmarked historic-era and prehistoric Native American burials, resulting in their alteration or damage. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 Potential to Uncover Human Remains.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 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 Section 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred.</li> <li>▶ 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 Community Development Director 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</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB 2641.	
<b>6.0 Cumulative Impacts</b>			
<b>6-1 Intersections without Dominguez Road</b>	LTS		
<b>6-2 Roadway Segments without Dominguez Road</b>	LTS		
<b>6-3 Intersections with Dominguez Road</b>	LTS		
<b>6-4 Roadway Segments with Dominguez Road</b>	LTS		
<b>6-5 Interstate 80/Sierra College Blvd. Interchange</b>	LTS		
<b>6-6 Freeway Mainline (I-80)</b>	LTS		
<b>6-7 Cumulative Operational (Regional) Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions</b>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 6-7: Cumulative Operational (Regional) Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions</b></p> <p>In accordance with the PCAPCD recommendations, the applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures during construction and operation of the proposed project (Backus, pers. comm., 2006b).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, identified in the Air Quality section of this EIR.</li> <li>▶ The City, after consultation with the applicant, shall require that all feasible emission control measures be incorporated into project design and operation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following items:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide access to public transit within ¼ mile of the project site, and transit enhancing infrastructure that includes transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs.</li> <li>• Provide pedestrian and bicycle enhancing infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>that includes wide sidewalks (i.e., at least five feet wide) and bikeways/paths connecting to a bikeway system, minimize pedestrian barriers (e.g., sound walls), and incorporate traffic-calming measures such as traffic circles, crosswalks, and bulb-outs at crosswalks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use solar, low-emissions, or central or tankless water heaters, increase wall and attic insulation beyond the currently applicable Title 24 requirements, and orient buildings to take advantage of passive solar heating and natural cooling, energy efficient windows (double pane and/or Low-E), and tree shading above that required by code, install photovoltaic cells, programmable thermostats for all heating and cooling systems, awnings or other shading mechanisms for windows and walkways, and utilize day lighting systems such as skylights, light shelves, interior transom windows.</li> <li>• The project shall include clean alternative energy features to promote energy self-sufficiency (e.g., photovoltaic cells, solar thermal electricity systems) and provide a minimum of 10% on-site renewable energy.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The project shall implement an off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project’s long-term ozone precursor emissions. The project’s off-site mitigation program must be approved by PCAPCD. The project’s off-site mitigation program provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the SVAB that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the SIP. The off-site mitigation program reduces emissions within the SVAB that would not otherwise be eliminated.</li> <li>▶ In lieu of the applicant implementing their own off-site mitigation program, the applicant can choose to participate in the PCAPCD Off-site Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the program, which would</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
		then be used offset emissions as described above. The actual amount of emission reductions needed through the Off-site Mitigation Program would be calculated when the project's average daily emissions have been determined.	
<b>6-8 Cumulative Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-9 Short-Term Construction-Generated Noise Levels</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-10 Long-Term Operational Stationary- and Area-Source Noise Levels</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-11 Long-Term Operational Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-12 Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-13 Cumulative Water Supply Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-14 Cumulative Wastewater Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-15 Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-16 Cumulative Electricity and Natural Gas Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-17 Cumulative Fire Protection Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-18 Cumulative Law Enforcement Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-19 Cumulative Schools Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-20 Cumulative Parks and Recreation Facilities Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-21 Cumulative Library Services Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-22 Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts</b>	S	No feasible mitigation is available.	SU
<b>6-23 Cumulative Public Health and Hazards Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>6-24 Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-25 Cumulative Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-26 Cumulative Agricultural Resources Impacts</b>	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	NI
<b>6-27 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts</b>	S	Implement the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12, Biological Resources.	SU
<b>6-28 Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-29 Land Use Impacts</b>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<b>6-30 Cumulative Contribution to Climate Change Impacts</b>		<p><b>Mitigation Measure 6-29: Cumulative Climate Change</b></p> <p>The proposed project includes the following specific measures which will assist in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Use of an automatic irrigation system and drip irrigation throughout the site to meet the requirements of the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act.</li> <li>▶ The project will meet Title 24 requirements which will reduce the amount of energy used by the residences.</li> </ul> <p>The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Section 6, Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts of this Draft EIR, to reduce GHG emissions. These measures are summarized as follows:</p> <p><b>Construction-Generated Emissions</b></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality of this Draft EIR addresses short-term construction-generated emissions and includes a listing of individual measures that are intended to reduce and minimize construction-generated emissions of fugitive dust and ozone precursors. Several components of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would also help to reduce GHG emissions. Such measures include 1) idling time for all diesel-fueled equipment shall be minimized to five minutes; 2)</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>ARB diesel fuel shall be used for all diesel-powered equipment; and 3) preparation of a plan for Placer County Air Pollution Control District approval that would demonstrate that heavy-duty off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project will achieve a project-wide fleet average 20 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and a 45% particulate matter reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. No additional mitigation for construction-generated GHG emissions is necessary.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Operational Emissions</b></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 6-7 identified in Section 6, Cumulative and Growth Inducing Impacts of this Draft EIR addresses cumulative operational (regional) emissions and includes a listing of individual measures that are intended to reduce and minimize cumulative operational criteria air pollutant and pressure emissions. Such measures include:</p> <p>1) The City, after consultation with the applicant, shall require that all feasible emission control measures be incorporated into project design and operation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Provide access to public transit within ¼ mile of the project site, and transit enhancing infrastructure that includes transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs.</li> <li>▶ Provide pedestrian and bicycle enhancing infrastructure that includes wide sidewalks (i.e. at least five feet wide), and bikeways/paths connecting to a bikeway system, minimize pedestrian barriers (e.g., sound walls), and incorporate traffic-calming measures such as traffic circles, crosswalks, and bulb-outs at crosswalks.</li> <li>▶ Use solar, low-emissions, or central or tankless water heaters, increase wall and attic insulation beyond currently applicable Title 24 requirements, and orient buildings to take advantage of passive solar heating and natural cooling, energy efficient windows (double pane and/or Low-E), and tree shading above that required by code, install</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>photovoltaic cells, programmable thermostats for all heating and cooling systems, awnings or other shading mechanisms for windows and walkways, and utilize day lighting systems such as skylights, light shelves, interior transom windows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The project shall include clean alternative energy features to promote energy self-sufficiency (e.g., photovoltaic cells, solar thermal electricity systems) and provide a minimum of 10% on-site renewable energy.</li> </ul> <p>2) The project shall implement an off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project’s long-term ozone precursor emissions. The project’s off-site mitigation program must be approved by PCAPCD. The project’s off-site mitigation program provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the SVAB that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the SIP. The off-site mitigation program reduces emissions within the SVAB that would not otherwise be eliminated.</p> <p>3) In lieu of the applicant implementing their own off-site mitigation program, the applicant can choose to participate in the PCAPCD Off-site Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the program, which would then be used offset emissions as described above. The actual amount of emission reductions needed through the Off-site Mitigation Program would be calculated when the project’s average daily emissions have been determined.</p>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

