

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	WHITNEY RANCH PHASE II PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
B.	PROJECT LOCATION: .....	2
<b>SECTION 2</b>	<b>CEQA BASIS FOR THIS ADDENDUM.....</b>	<b>3</b>
A.	INTENDED USES OF THIS ADDENDUM .....	4
B.	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION .....	4
C.	COMPARISON OF THE APPROVED PROJECT AREA TO THE NEW PROJECT: .....	5
<b>SECTION 3</b>	<b>IMPACT ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
A.	EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CATEGORIES .....	8
B.	ENVIRONMENTAL CATEGORIES ANALYSIS .....	10
1.	<i>Aesthetics</i> .....	10
2.	<i>Agriculture</i> .....	12
3.	<i>Air Quality</i> .....	13
4.	<i>Biological Resources</i> .....	15
5.	<i>Cultural Resources</i> .....	18
6.	<i>Geology and Soils</i> .....	20
7.	<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .....	22
8.	<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .....	25
9.	<i>Land Use and Planning</i> .....	29
10.	<i>Mineral Resources</i> .....	33
11.	<i>Noise</i> .....	34
12.	<i>Population and Housing</i> .....	37
13.	<i>Public Services</i> .....	38
15.	<i>Transportation/Traffic</i> .....	44
16.	<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .....	48
<b>SECTION 4</b>	<b>CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....</b>	<b>53</b>
A.	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING .....	53
B.	REGULATORY SETTING .....	59
C.	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	63
D.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	66
E.	PROJECT EFFECTS ON GLOBAL CLIMATE .....	67
F.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTION STRATEGIES .....	68
<b>SECTION 5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>SECTION 6</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>82</b>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

## **SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION**

This document is the first Addendum to the *Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Draft Environmental Impact Report* certified on July 9, 2002 by City Council Resolution No. 2002-230 (hereinafter "NWRA EIR"). This Addendum has been prepared to address changes to the project since it was evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR), in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines §15164. In addition, since the certification of the NWRA EIR, the state has enacted legislation aimed at reducing California's Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This Addendum also evaluates the Project's impact on global climate change and sets forth an extensive list of Greenhouse Gas Emissions reduction measures to achieve the goals of AB32 and the Governor's Executive Order S-3-05.

### **A. WHITNEY RANCH PHASE II PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project is a component of the overall Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) project and was analyzed as a part of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) EIR, approved and certified by City Council Resolution No. 2002-230. A Draft EIR was prepared for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) project, including Whitney Ranch Phase II, and released for public review in October 2001. Following the close of the public comment period on the Draft NWRA EIR, a NWRA Final EIR was completed on March 20, 2002. The Final NWRA EIR was certified by the Rocklin City Council on July 9, 2002.

Whitney Ranch Phase II (for purposes of this Addendum the "Project") is a request for approval of a large lot tentative subdivision map that will divide the 641-acre site into 51 large parcels referred to as Units. A small lot tentative subdivision map is also being processed concurrently that would further subdivide most of the residentially designated Units into a total of 1,376 single family residential lots. Project implementation includes construction of on-site streets, public pedestrian and bicycle trails, landscaping, fencing, water, sewer and storm drainage facilities, utilities including telephone, electrical, and natural gas lines, storm water detention areas, off-site sewer improvements and the off-site widening of West Oaks Boulevard. Associated entitlements include an Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit to address the proposed removal of oak trees, a General Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment to reflect renumbering of Units

and adjustments to land use designations, densities and development standards at various locations throughout the project. The final entitlement request is approval of architectural and landscaping Design Review for single family residential homes on proposed lots that are less than 6,000 square feet in area.

**B. PROJECT LOCATION:**

The 641 acre Whitney Ranch Phase II project is the eastern portion of the overall Whitney Ranch (Sunset Ranchos) master planned development in northwest Rocklin. The Whitney Ranch Phase II area is bordered on the north by the Twelve Bridges (Catta Vadera) development in the City of Lincoln. The eastern portion of the project area is bounded by Whitney Oaks Drive and the Whitney Oaks subdivision in Rocklin. The western edge is bounded by existing single-family neighborhoods in Whitney Ranch Phase I and various open space parcels. The southern edge of the project is bounded by several existing single-family neighborhoods in Stanford Ranch and Whitney Oaks subdivisions in Rocklin.

## **SECTION 2 CEQA BASIS FOR THIS ADDENDUM**

State CEQA Guidelines §15164(a) requires a lead agency to prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR “if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” A subsequent (or supplemental) EIR is required only if the changes would result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts, compared with the impacts identified in the Final EIR. Public Resources Code section 21166 and Section 15162 provide the framework for analysis of the adequacy of prior environmental review of a subsequent project. The questions that must be addressed when making a determination of whether further environmental review would be necessary are as follows:

### **1) DO PROPOSED CHANGES INVOLVE NEW SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, will the changes represented by the current project result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact?

### **2) ANY NEW CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVING NEW IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, have there been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) which have occurred subsequent to the prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact?

### **3) ANY NEW INFORMATION REQUIRING NEW ANALYSIS OR VERIFICATION?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, is there new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete that is now available requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid? If the new information shows that:

(A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; or

(B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or

(C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, then the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR would be required.

However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this environmental review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified environmental impacts are not found to be more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary, then no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required. An addendum is the appropriate document if the changes would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts. An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR, as indicated in State CEQA Guidelines §15164(c).

As analyzed in Section 3 of this document, the proposed changes in the Whitney Ranch Phase II project would not result in any new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Nor will the Project, after implementing all planned mitigation measures, have a significant impact on Global Warming from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Consequently, revisions to the Final EIR are not required and none of the other conditions listed in the State CEQA Guidelines §15162 are present or have occurred. Therefore, the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed project revision is an addendum to the EIR, as required by §15164(a). This conclusion is based on the analysis provided in this document, the supporting documentation referenced in this document, and all of the information and analysis contained in the Final EIR.

#### **A. INTENDED USES OF THIS ADDENDUM**

An addendum to an EIR is an informational document used in the planning and decision-making process. The purpose of the addendum is not to recommend either approval or denial of a project; but rather its purpose is to disclose objective information so that informed decisions can be made. The intent of this addendum to the Final EIR is to provide City of Rocklin decision-makers with additional information regarding the original project's potential environmental impacts that was not available at the time of the certification of the Final EIR.

#### **B. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

A number of documents were used to prepare this Addendum to the NWRA EIR. These documents include the following:

- Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) SCH No 99102012, EIP Associates, October 2001
- Final Environmental Impact Report for the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) SCH No 99102012, EIP Associates, March 2002
- Alternative Approaches to Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents, Association of Environmental Professionals, Final - June 29, 2007
- CEQA and Climate Change; Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, January 2008
- CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, June 19, 2008
- Draft Drainage Master Plan for Whitney Ranch Phase II (Newland Communities), prepared by G.C. Wallace Companies (November 30, 2007). (Document available for public inspection during regular business hours at the Community Development Department of the City of Rocklin, at 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677.)
- Carbon Footprint of Single-Family Residential New Construction, Prepared for California Building Industry Association, Prepared BY ConSol, Jim Hodgson, Jackson Thach, Matthew Fund, Date May 27, 2008

**C. COMPARISON OF THE APPROVED PROJECT AREA TO THE NEW PROJECT:**

The NWRA EIR addressed the annexation and development of the entire Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, which encompassed approximately 1,874 acres. The NWRA EIR assumed implementation of a phased project that would be developed and managed in accordance with a General Development Plan consisting of the geographic sub-areas of: 1) the Whitney Ranch (Sunset Ranchos) master community plan; 2) the State Highway Route 65 corridor planning area, and 3) the eastern most residential area identified as Parcel K, which is now built out and known as the Claremont Estates subdivision. The analysis of the Whitney Ranch (Sunset Ranchos) master community plan area, of which the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project is a part, assumed the development of 3,187 single family units, 1,186 multi-family units (4,373 residential units overall), 344,100 square feet of commercial land uses, and 158,100 square feet of business professional land uses. The changes contemplated by the revised Project will

reduce development of residential units by about 60 homes and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. All existing boundaries for developable areas remain the same except for one small change in the former Unit 37 explained below. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure.

Outside of a single 1.4 acre open space area originally denoted Unit 37, there are no changes of types of land use and there are no changes to the boundaries of the area contemplated for development. With the finer engineering detail which is a part of the small lot mapping process, an additional 57 acres of open space has been added to the project through the small lot tentative maps. These open space areas are portions of lots zoned for residential development that are required by the project conditions of approval to be set aside as open space. Public open space and conservation easements will be recorded over the open space areas of the affected properties. Therefore, although the project would lose 1.4 acres of open space on Unit 37, the net effect on open space resources in the project will be a gain of over 55 acres. Project biologists ECORP Consulting, Inc. have evaluated the area formerly identified as Unit 37 and report that the area consists of a grassy type swale that contains no wetlands or waters of the United States, no special status species or habitat, no cultural resources and no oak trees.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II project applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment, a General Development Plan Amendment, approval of a Large Lot Subdivision Map, multiple Small Lot Subdivision Maps, a Design Review, and Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit. The NWRA EIR analysis assumed development of Whitney Ranch Phase II consistent with the General Plan and General Development Plan in effect at the time the EIR was prepared, but because the applicant is requesting entitlements from the City that would amend the General Plan and the General Development Plan, the City is required to analyze whether the changes now proposed to the General Plan and General Development Plan create new environmental impacts that were not previously analyzed in the NWRA EIR.

The changes proposed to the General Plan and General Development Plan generally reflect renumbering of Units and adjustments to land use designations, densities and development standards at various locations throughout the project. It is important to note that there are no proposed changes to the existing developable boundaries that were analyzed in the NWRA EIR, with the exception of Unit 37 discussed in more detail at the Land Use section below.



In addition to the land use changes, minor changes to park sites, detention basins, and development standards are analyzed in Section 3 of this Addendum. Finally, there is a proposed optional sewer line rerouting for consideration. This addendum will look at the optional alignment and evaluate the potential impacts of that alignment as compared to the existing approved alignment in the Utilities section of Section 3 of this Addendum.

## **SECTION 3 IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The purpose of this impact analysis is to evaluate the categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e. changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigations in prior environmental documents. The environmental categories will be answered with a “no” in the checklist if the Whitney Ranch Phase II project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the prior environmental documents.

### **A. EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CATEGORIES**

#### **WHERE IMPACT WAS ANALYZED**

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the prior environmental documents where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

#### **DO PROPOSED CHANGES INVOLVE NEW SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project will result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

#### **ANY NEW CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVING NEW IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) which have occurred subsequent to the prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

#### **ANY NEW INFORMATION REQUIRING NEW ANALYSIS OR VERIFICATION?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid. If the new information shows that: (A) the

project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; or (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, then the question would be answered 'Yes' requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this Environmental Review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified environmental impacts are not found to be more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary, then the question would be answered 'No' and no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required. New studies completed as part of this environmental review are attached to this Addendum, or are on file with the Planning Department.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES ADDRESSING IMPACTS.**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the prior environmental document provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigations have already been implemented. A "yes" response will be provided in either instance. If "NA" is indicated, this Environmental Review concludes that the impact does not occur with this project and therefore no mitigations are needed.

#### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category in order to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL CATEGORIES ANALYSIS**

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
<b>I. Aesthetics. Would the Project:</b>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter M	No	No	No	NA
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter M	No	No	No	NA
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter M	No	No	No	NA
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter M	No	No	No	Yes MMM-3a & b
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<p>Chapter M -- Visual Resources of the Draft NWRA EIR examined the aesthetics impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) and acknowledged that the development of the NWRA project would have less than significant and unavoidable impacts on visual resources. Specifically, it concluded that (1) the proposed project would replace the undeveloped character of the project site with an urban setting which would be a significant and unavoidable impact with no mitigation measures available; (2) the project could result in development that is considered visually incompatible with the existing and planned residential uses, but that impact would be a less than significant impact; (3) light and glare from the proposed project could substantially alter the nighttime lighting character of the area which would be a significant and</p>					

unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures; (4) the project would contribute to the cumulative change in visual character of the region from undeveloped open grazing land to urban development which would be a significant and unavoidable impact with no mitigation measures available, and (5) the project would contribute to cumulative light and glare, reducing views of the nighttime sky in the region and that contribution would also be a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NwRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NwRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure.

The proposed changes to the project related to land use designations and zoning will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of previously identified significant impact on aesthetics because the changes will result in fewer visible housing units and more visible open space, thus slightly decreasing the overall aesthetic impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, and specification of the location of detention basins will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on aesthetics because such changes are considered to be refinements of what has been previously approved and such refinements will not result in new development features of the project that were not already anticipated in the NwRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to aesthetics identified in the NwRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NwRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NwRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The aesthetics and visual

resources analysis within the NWRRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigated or Address Impacts.
<b>2. Agriculture. Would the project:</b>					
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Initial Study	No	No	No	NA
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Initial Study	No	No	No	NA
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	Initial Study	No	No	No	NA
<b>Discussion:</b>					
The NWRRA EIR did not contain an agricultural resources chapter since the NWRRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) is not considered as prime farm or agricultural lands, so a conversion of designated prime farmlands to a non-agricultural use will not occur. The NWRRA project area, including the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area, is not currently used or zoned for agricultural production and is not under a Williamson Act contract, so a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williams Act contract would not occur.					

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>3. Air Quality. Would the project:</b>					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter G	No	No	No	NA
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter G	No	No	No	Yes GMM-1a-b, GMM-2a-g
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter G	No	No	No	Yes GMM-5
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter G	No	No	No	Yes GMM-4
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter G	No	No	No	NA

**Discussion:**

Chapter G – Air Quality of the Draft NWRA EIR examined the air quality impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR concluded that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant and significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality. Specifically, it concluded that (1) construction activities associated with the proposed project could generate criteria air pollutants that would exceed Placer County APCD thresholds and this impact would be a short-term significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures; (2) the operation of the project could result in the generation of both vehicle and area source air pollutants, increasing total air pollutant emissions which would be a significant and unavoidable impact even with

mitigation measures; (3) the proposed project could increase CO concentrations at some intersections which would be a less than significant impact; (4) the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to stationary source pollutants and air toxic contaminants which would be a less than significant impact; (5) the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development, could hinder the PCAPCD's ability to bring the region into attainment for Ozone and PM10 resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures, and (6) the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development, could result in increases of CO concentrations at some intersections, though that would be a less than significant impact.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NWRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure.

Since the changes result in an equivalent amount of development, the Project would generate an equivalent amount of construction activities, operational emissions, and traffic, as well as, stationary source pollutants and would contribute in an equivalent manner to regional air quality impacts. The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, and specification of the location of detention basins will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on air quality because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area that would lead to additional construction emissions or additional automobile emissions beyond what was previously considered in the NWRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to air quality identified in the NWRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. For these reasons, no new air quality impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</b>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter Q	No	No	No	Yes QMM-1a-c
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter Q	No	No	No	Yes QMM-4
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter Q	No	No	No	Yes QMM-3a&b
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter Q	No	No	No	Yes QMM-6a-c QMM-7a&b
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter Q	No	No	No	NA

policy or ordinance.			No	No		No	NA
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter Q	No				No	NA

**Discussion:**  
Chapter Q – Biological Resources of the Draft NWRA EIR examined the biological resources impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant and significant and unavoidable impacts on biological resources. Specifically, it concluded that (1) implementation of the proposed project could result in the loss of rare plant populations which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures; (2) the implementation of the proposed project would result in the loss of native oak trees resulting in a short-term significant and unavoidable, and long-term less than significant impact with mitigation measures; (3) the proposed project will result in the loss of wetlands that are subject to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation; (4) the proposed project will result in impacts to stream channels in the project area which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures; (5) the proposed project would result in the loss of individual Valley Elderberry longhorn beetles and their habitat, but this would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures; (6) the proposed project would result in the disturbance of nesting raptors and/or loss of their nesting habitat which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures; (7) the proposed project would result in the loss of federally listed vernal pool crustaceans and their habitat that would be a less than significant impact with mitigation; (8) the proposed project could conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan which would be a less than significant impact, and (9) the proposed project, in combination with other development projects occurring in Western Placer County, would contribute to a regional loss of wetlands and habitat for plants and wildlife resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation measures.

The biological consulting firm of ECORP Consulting Inc. was requested to evaluate whether the changes associated with the Whitney Ranch Phase II project would affect the project's U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit. In a letter to the City dated February 20, 2008, ECORP determined that the Whitney Ranch Phase II development is in conformance with the Nationwide Permit 26 and the Letter of Permission issued for the Whitney Ranch project. ECORP also noted that the Phase II Open Space Operations and Management Plan that has been prepared in accordance with the Whitney Ranch Phase II development package will be submitted to

the City and Corps for their approvals, that such plan reflects some minor modifications from the original permit, but, the Phase II Open Space Operations and Maintenance Plan maintains the overall Corps Open Space acreages and will impact the jurisdictional waters of the United States slightly less than allowed by the permit.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NWRRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure. Although the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project includes development on a previously defined open space area, that area was surveyed by professional biologists and it was determined that the area consists of a grassy type swale that contains no wetlands or waters of the United States, no special status species or habitat, no cultural resources and no oak trees. No additional development and more open space translates to fewer biological resources impacts. Beyond the open space area that is now proposed for development mentioned above, the Whitney Ranch Phase II project does not propose development in areas that had not previously been considered for development under the NWRRA EIR nor is there an increase in the number of oak trees proposed for removal. For these reasons, no new biological resources impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and possible rerouting of a portion of the sewer line near the Claremont Estates will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on biological resources because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area that would lead to additional biological resources impacts that were not previously considered in the NWRRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to biological resources identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:</b>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter N	No	No	No	Yes NMM-1a&b NMM-2a&b NMM-3
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter N	No	No	No	Yes NMM-1a&b NMM-2a&b NMM-3
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter N	No	No	No	Yes NMM-1a&b NMM-2a&b NMM-3
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter N	No	No	No	Yes NMM-1a&b NMM-2a&b NMM-3

**Discussion:**

Chapter N – Cultural Resources of the Draft NWRA EIR examined the biological resources impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant and significant and unavoidable impacts on biological resources. Specifically, it concluded that (1) implementation of the proposed project could damage or destroy previously unidentified historic and/or prehistoric resources, but would be a less than significant impact with

mitigation measures; (2) implementation of the proposed project could damage or destroy prehistoric resource PL-2 which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation; (3) construction of offsite infrastructure could damage or destroy undiscovered archaeological and/or historic resources which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation, and (4) the proposed project, in combination with additional development in the City and County, could disturb previously identified or unidentified cultural resources resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation.

The NWRRA EIR identified a mitigation measure that would reduce the PL-2 resource impact to less than significant, namely if in-place preservation was not possible, the project applicant shall consult with concerned Native Americans and move the boulder to another location where it can be preserved, and if a deposit is present, data recovery excavations shall be conducted. The NWRRA EIR identified that implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to less than significant. The mitigation measure has already been implemented and the proposed GPA and GDP amendments will not interfere with the completed implementation of the mitigation measure as the PL-2 resource has been moved to an open space area that is not part of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area.

Although the Whitney Ranch Phase II project includes proposed GPA and GDP amendments to the land use designations and zoning for many of the parcels, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not alter the developable area boundaries of the previously analyzed NWRRA project area. Since no other known cultural resource existed on the site and the proposed GPA and GDP amendments do not alter the developable area boundaries that were examined in the NWRRA EIR, the only potential impacts from the changes in proposed development are potential impacts to unknown and undiscovered cultural resources.

This potential has always existed at the Whitney Ranch Phase II project location as part of the development of homes and other uses on the lots. However, the NWRRA EIR contained a mitigation measure to address this potential impact. The mitigation measure required the project to inform construction workers of potentially sensitive cultural resource areas prior to construction, and if evidence of a cultural resource is uncovered during grading or construction, work is halted and further research is done. Such a requirement is still applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project with proposed GPA and GDP amendments.

All other proposed changes to the Project will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on cultural resources because beyond resource PL-2, there were no other known cultural resources on the NWRRA project site so such changes would not impact any known cultural resources. Mitigation measures related to cultural resources identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. For these reasons, no new cultural resources impacts

associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, nor will there be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigated or Address Impacts.
<p><b>6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</b></p> <p>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides?</p> <p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p> <p>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</p> <p>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating</p>	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter O	No	No	No	Yes See Impact O-1 OMM-2a&b
	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter O	No	No	No	NA See Impact O-3
	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter O	No	No	No	Yes OMM-2a&b
	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter O	No	No	No	Yes OMM-2a&b

substantial risks to life or property?									
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter O	No	No	No	No	Yes	OMM-2a&b		

**Discussion:**

Chapter O – Geology, Seismicity, and Soils of the Draft NWRRA EIR examined the geology, soils and seismicity impacts of the development of the NWRRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant, and significant and unavoidable, impacts on geology, soils and seismicity. Specifically, it concluded that (1) people and property could be subject to seismic groundshaking but this impact would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) site development would occur in areas underlain with Mehrten Formation, granitic materials, or in areas with shallow or expansive soils, which could present geotechnical hazards or require special construction methods and this impact would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) site development could result in topographic alteration and soil disturbance, which could lead to increased erosion potential which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, and (4) the proposed project, in combination with buildout under the General Plan, could expose a greater number of people and property to seismic hazards such as seismic groundshaking, hazards associated with geologic or soils conditions, and potential effects of erosion which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II project includes proposed GPA and GDP amendments to the land use designations and zoning for many of the parcels, but there is no net change in development and all development will remain within the areas previously identified for development. The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project also includes a net increase of about 55 acres of open space. Equivalent development and more open space translates to less exposure of structures to seismic conditions and less development that could result in soil disturbance and erosion potential. For these reasons, no new geology, soils and seismicity impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and sewer line relocation will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on

geology, soils and seismicity because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area that would lead to an increase of developed structures or an increase in soil disturbance and erosion potential beyond what was previously considered in the NWRRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to geology, soils and seismicity identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</b>					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	NA
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	Yes LMM-2a-d
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	NA
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	NA
e. For a project located within an airport land use	Draft NWRRA	No	No	No	NA



plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	EIR Chapter L					
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project area?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	No	NA
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	No	NA
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter L	No	No	No	No	Yes See Impact L-3 L,MM-3a-c

**Discussion:**

The NWRA contained Chapter L - Public Safety and Hazards that examined the public safety and hazards impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant impacts on public safety and hazards. Specifically, it concluded that (1) development of the proposed project could result in the use, generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials within the project site but the impact would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) development of the project site could expose construction workers and the public to contaminated soil and/or groundwater which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) implementation of the proposed project could increase the potential for wildland fires and create emergency ingress/egress problems which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (4) development of the proposed project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Rocklin, would increase the number of people who could be exposed to potential hazards associated with potentially contaminated soil and groundwater and an increase in the transport, storage and use of hazardous materials, and that would be a less than significant impact, and (5) implementation of the proposed project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Rocklin could increase the number of people exposed to hazards associated with wildland fires which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NWRRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure. Equivalent development in the revised project creates no new exposure of structures and people to hazards such as use, generation, storage and disposal of hazardous material and less exposure of structures and people to wildland fires. While it is recognized that more open space could result in greater opportunities for wildland fires, implementation of the NWRRA EIR mitigation measures would reduce such an impact to a less than significant level. For these reasons, no new public safety and hazards impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and sewer line relocation will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on public safety and hazards because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area that would lead to an increase of developed structures or increases in population beyond what was previously considered in the NWRRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to public safety and hazards identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NWRRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NWRRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The conclusions reached in the NWRRA EIR with respect to the CEQA Initial Study checklist questions for public safety and hazards (would the NWRRA project: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the

release of hazardous materials into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, of waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands) are no different as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. The analysis within the NWRRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>8. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project:</b>					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	NA
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	NA

production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?									
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	NA See Impact P-4	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-2a-c PMM-3	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-2a-c PMM-3	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-2	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-1	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-1	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-1	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter P	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes PMM-1	

**Discussion:**

The NWRA contained a hydrology and water quality chapter that examined the hydrology and water quality impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than

significant and unavoidable impacts on hydrology and water quality. Specifically, it concluded that (1) the proposed project could expose persons and structures to hazards associated with a 100-year flood would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) the proposed project would increase the rate of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces, which could contribute to localized or downstream flooding would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) the proposed project could increase the volume of stormwater runoff, which could increase water surface elevations that would contribute to localized or downstream flooding would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (4) grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed project could degrade water quality through the increased generation of sediment would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (5) stormwater runoff from the proposed project could contain urban contaminants that could degrade water quality would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, and (6) construction activity associated with the proposed project, in combination with other development that could occur within the Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek watersheds, could affect downstream water quality would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.

The engineering firm of G.C.Wallace evaluated the Whitney Ranch Phase II project in light of the overall Drainage Master Plan for Whitney Ranch dated June 16, 1999 (revised May 29, 2003) by Terrance Lowell & Associates, Inc. (TLA) and concluded that the Whitney Ranch Phase II land uses, corresponding drainage subsheds and detention facilities result in project drainage discharges that are equal to or lower than the flows developed in the TLA Drainage Master Plan for the NWRA EIR. Their evaluation also noted that in addition to maintaining the same or lower flow rates as adopted in the NWRA EIR, the updated onsite drainage collection and detention system is designed in conformance with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM), providing the same design criteria as the original drainage study contained in the adopted NWRA EIR. GC Wallace's evaluation concludes by noting that the proposed hydrology, hydraulics and drainage facilities within Whitney Ranch Phase II Drainage Master Plan conform to the original discharge rates in the previously adopted NWRA EIR.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 5.5 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NWRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area,

the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure. Since development is substantially equivalent to the approved project analyzed under the certified NWRA EIR and more open space will be created, no new hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and the sewer line relocation will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on hydrology and water quality because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area that would lead to an increase of impervious surfaces or increases in stormwater runoff beyond what was previously considered in the NWRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to hydrology and water quality identified in the NWRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NWRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NWRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The analysis within the NWRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigated or Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>9. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:</b>					
a. Physically divide an established community?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter E	No	No	No	NA
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter E	No	No	No	NA
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter E	No	No	No	NA

**Discussion:**

Chapter E – Land Use of the NWRA EIR examined the land use impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant impacts on land use. Specifically, it concluded that (1) the proposed project would convert agricultural/grazing land to non-agricultural uses resulting in less than significant impact, (2) the proposed project would allow development of land uses that could be incompatible with existing or planned surrounding land uses also resulting in a less than significant impact, (3) the proposed project could allow development of land uses that could be internally incompatible which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (4) the proposed project could be inconsistent with the City’s General Plan or other City plans, policies or ordinances but this impact would be less than significant, (5) the proposed project could be inconsistent with Placer County LAFCO guidelines and policies but this would be a less than significant impact, and (6) the proposed project could restrict the amount of right-of-way available for a State highway

interchange at North Whitney Boulevard (Parkway A) but this would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II project applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment, a General Development Plan Amendment, approval of a Large Lot Subdivision Map, multiple Small Lot Subdivision Maps, a Design Review, and an Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit. The NWRA EIR analysis assumed development of Whitney Ranch Phase II consistent with the General Plan and General Development Plan in effect at the time the EIR was prepared, but because the applicant is requesting entitlements from the City that would amend the General Plan and the General Development Plan, the City is required to analyze whether the changes now proposed to the General Plan and General Development Plan create new environmental impacts that were not previously analyzed in the NWRA EIR. The changes proposed to the General Plan and General Development Plan generally reflect renumbering of Units and adjustments to land use designations, densities and development standards at various locations throughout the project. It is important to note that there are no proposed changes to the actual developable area boundaries that were analyzed in the NWRA EIR, with the exception of Unit 37 discussed in more detail below.

#### Change in Land Use Designations

The proposed General Plan Amendment ("GPA") would change the 1.4 acre parcel, Unit 37, from a land use designation of Recreation/Conservation to Low Density Residential. The proposed General Development Plan Amendment ("GDP"), sets zoning development standards and criteria for Unit 37 to be consistent with a low density residential land use designation. Although the GPA re-designation would result in the project losing 1.4 acres of open space, the applicant is also proposing to add approximately 57 acres of open space to the project through the small lot tentative maps. Overall, the changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged.

With the finer engineering detail which is a part of the small lot mapping process, an additional 57 acres of open space has been added to the project through the small lot tentative maps. These open space areas are portions of lots zoned for residential development that are required by the project conditions of approval to be set aside as open space. Public open space and conservation easements will be recorded over the open space areas of the affected properties. Therefore, although the project would lose 1.4 acres of open space on Unit 37, the net effect on open space resources in the project will be a gain of over 55 acres. These open space areas are portions of lots zoned for residential development that will be set aside as open space through the recording of open space and conservation



easements over the properties. Therefore, although the project would lose 1.4 acres of open space on Unit 37, the net effect on open space resources in the project will be a gain of over 55 acres. Project biologists ECORP Consulting, Inc. have evaluated the area formerly identified as Unit 37 and report that the area consists of a grassy type swale that contains no wetlands or waters of the United States, no special status species or habitat, no cultural resources and no oak trees.

In addition to the change in land use for Unit 37, the proposed GPA would change the land use designation for several of the Units in the project designated for residential development. The GDP would revise the associated zoning to be consistent with these changes. The changes to the residentially designated parcels would either increase or decrease densities, but none would change the land use type to another type of development such as commercial, retail, industrial. And except for the one instance at Unit 37, none of the changes in land use and zoning expand the boundaries of the previously analyzed development envelope.

#### Changes in Park Parcels

Two previous neighborhood park sites referred to as Units 46 and 69, consisting of 3.6 and 3.5 acres respectively, are proposed to be consolidated into a single 5.5 acre neighborhood park site that is more centrally located within the project. The proposed GPA would redesignate portions of the Unit 46 and 69 sites to residential, equaling a net loss of 1.6 acres of parkland. In addition the location of the previously analyzed neighborhood parks on Units 46 and 69 are proposed to be located in a slightly different area than analyzed in the NWRRA EIR, but still within the approved developable area boundaries that were assumed in the NWRRA EIR.

#### Specification of Location of Detention Basins

The proposed Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps have identified the specific location of detention basins. The general location, size and number of these detention basins was assumed and identified in the NWRRA EIR. The proposed project merely specifies the exact locations, number and size of the detention basins based on more refined engineering and technical data generated with the small lot map application. The basins are all located within the same general areas as analyzed in the NWRRA EIR, and are also still located within the approved developable boundaries that were assumed in the NWRRA EIR.

#### Development Standard Changes

The proposed General Development Plan Amendment also includes requests to modify development standards as follows: a) Change

and/or add a number of development standards (setbacks, etc.) for single family and multi-family residential zoning categories; b) Modify the language of the single story restriction on lots adjacent to or across the street from a Commercial/Business Professional use (except open space) to exempt Units 44B and 52A from that requirement; and c) Modify the language of the requirement for varied front yard setbacks along all residential streets to exempt all developments with lot sizes less than 6,000 square feet, for which Design Review is required.

These proposed development standard changes would modify the existing development standards under which development could occur, but such changes would not result in an increased amount of development nor development in areas that were previously not planned for or assumed. As such, these changes are not anticipated to result in additional environmental impacts and therefore the discussion below will focus on evaluating the other requested specific changes described above in items 1-4.

#### Conclusion

The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will result equivalent development to the intensity, density and scope analyzed in the NWRA EIR, and except as noted, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not alter the developable area boundaries of the previously analyzed NWRA project area. The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project GPA and GDP refinements will also result in consistency between proposed land uses and proposed zoning designations. For these reasons, no new land use impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and the sewer line relocation will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on land use because these changes do not result in an overall increase of developable area and the changes would result in consistency between land use and zoning designations. Mitigation measures related to land use identified in the NWRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>10. Mineral Resources. Would the Project:</b>					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Initial Study	No	No	No	NA
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	Initial Study	No	No	No	NA
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<p>The NWRA EIR did not contain a mineral resources chapter because the proposed NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) is not known to contain mineral resources, so the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will not occur. Because the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area is within the NWRA project area that was analyzed in the NWRA EIR, and because the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments will not alter the existing developable area boundaries of the previously analyzed NWRA project area, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not result in a mineral resources impact.</p>					

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>II. Noise. Would the project result in:</b>					
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	Yes HMM-1a&b HMM-2a&b HMM-4 HMM-5
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	Yes HMM-1a&b
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	Yes HMM-1a&b HMM-2a&b HMM-4 HMM-5
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	Yes HMM-1a&b HMM-2a&b HMM-4 HMM-5
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	NA

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter H	No	No	No	NA
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>The NWRA contained a noise chapter that examined the noise impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant and significant and unavoidable impacts on noise. Specifically, it concluded that (1) construction of the proposed project could temporarily increase noise levels at existing noise sensitive land uses would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) the proposed project would result in residential development within close proximity to existing and proposed roadways. These new residential areas could be exposed to exterior traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Rocklin Noise Compatibility Guidelines would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) project generated traffic is expected to result in changes to noise levels on the existing street system in the project vicinity ranging from -0.8 dB Ldn to +5.0 dB Ldn would be a less than significant impact, (4) there are a variety of stationary noise sources associated with the future development within the Plan area that have the potential to create noise levels in excess of the City of Rocklin Noise Compatibility Guidelines or result in annoyance at existing and future noise-sensitive developments within the Plan Area. Such uses/noise sources include, but are not limited to, commercial loading docks associated with such uses as grocery stores, school playgrounds, and neighborhood parks would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (5) operation of open athletic fields and recreation areas, including the assemblage of large crowds and the use of public address systems could result in noise levels that would adversely affect adjacent residents would be a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures, and (6) project generated traffic, in conjunction with future development in the area, is expected to result in a change in noise levels on the existing street system ranging from -2.5 dB Ldn to +0.5 dB Ldn would be a less than significant impact.</p> <p>The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the</p>					

areas identified in the NwRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure. The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not alter the existing developable area boundaries of the previously analyzed NwRA project area and it will not affect the location of large open athletic fields and recreation areas. For these reasons, no new noise impacts associated with the development of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project are anticipated, and it is also anticipated that there would not be an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and relocation of the sewer line will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on noise because these changes do not result in an expected increase in noise levels. Mitigation measures related to land use identified in the NwRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NwRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NwRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>12. Population and Housing. Would the Project:</b>					
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter I	No	No	No	NA
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter I	No	No	No	NA
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter I	No	No	No	NA

**Discussion:**

Chapter I – Population, Employment and Housing of the NWRA EIR examined the population, employment and housing impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that population and housing impacts would not occur as a result of the development and implementation of the proposed NWRA project and mitigation measures were not identified.

The proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will result in equivalent development to that analyzed for the same project area under the NWRA EIR, and except as noted, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments will not alter the developable area boundaries of the previously analyzed NWRA project area and add additional development. For these reasons, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will result in the same population and employment growth previously analyzed in the NWRA EIR.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NWRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NWRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The analysis within the NWRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>13. Public Services.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any the public services:	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
Fire protection?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
Police protection?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
Schools?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
Parks?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA



Other public facilities?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Chapter K of the NWRA EIR included the topics of law enforcement, fire protection and emergency services, schools, and parks and recreation. The NWRA EIR examined the public services impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) and acknowledged that public services impacts would have less than significant impacts on public services. Specifically, it concluded that (1) the proposed project would increase the demand for law enforcement services and facilities in the City of Rocklin but this would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) the proposed project, in combination with future development in the City, would create demand for additional law enforcement services and facilities but this demand would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) the proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection/suppression services and emergency services. The project would require approximately 12 additional fire personnel but this demand would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (4) the proposed project could result in the placement of residences farther than the two road mile service area of the closest fire station but with the addition of a new fire station would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (5) the proposed project could result in residential development upon terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (6) the proposed project could result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department current emergency Radio Communications System resulting in a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (7) the proposed project, in combination with other development in the City, would create demand for additional fire protection and emergency services but this demand would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (8) the proposed project would increase demand for school services in the Rocklin Unified School District but would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (9) the proposed project, in combination with future development in the RUSD, would increase demand for school services in the RUSD but this demand would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (10) the proposed project would increase the demand for park facilities which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, and (11) the proposed project, in combination with other development in the City, would increase the demand for park facilities but this demand would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.</p> <p>The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 60 dwelling units and increase open space by about 55 acres. Commercial land uses will increase slightly by about 3 acres, but business professional land uses will be reduced slightly from the totals analyzed in the certified NWRA EIR. The location of backbone infrastructure, including all major</p>					

streets, remains unchanged. Although a 1.4 acre area previously designated for open space will now be incorporated into a residential development, there is an overall net increase of approximately 55 acres of open space as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. Other than that change of 1.4 acres, all other development of the Project continues to remain completely within the areas identified in the NwRA EIR for development. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure. For these reasons, the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will result in equivalent demand for public services in relation to the demand for public services previously analyzed in the NwRA EIR.

#### Law Enforcement

The approved NwRA project did not have a significant impact on the demand for law enforcement personnel, because although the project would create the need for increased law enforcement services, this impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level through the payment of general taxes including a construction tax. It was also recognized that other mechanisms exist to provide law enforcement funding, and that the construction tax and other funding mechanisms would provide for new police services. Because the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project will result in an equivalent amount of development as analyzed for the same project area under the NwRA EIR, the Project would not increase the need for law enforcement services. Less residential units would yield fewer new residents, thus requiring less assistance from law enforcement personnel, but non residential demands would offset that decrease. The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and relocation of a portion of sewer line will have no new significant impacts on law enforcement services because these do not significantly affect the amount of people needing protection or requiring enforcement.

#### Fire Protection & Emergency Services

The City was able to impose mitigation measures on the previously identified project to lessen the project's impacts increasing the demand for fire and emergency service to less than significant. The mitigation included ensuring access and maintenance of open space or undeveloped areas within the project, paying fees including a fire services tax, and implementing all Uniform Fire Code provisions. Since the proposed land use designation and zoning changes to the project will provide for substantially equal development in Whitney Ranch Phase II from the amount analyzed in the NwRA EIR, the project's burden on fire personnel will remain the same. Furthermore, the developer is still required to apply mitigation measures of paying fees and complying with Uniform

Fire Code provision when building the project with its changes.

Another potentially significant impact to fire protection services was placing residences outside the 2 road mile service areas of the closet fire station. The proposed land use and zoning changes for most of the parcels will not exceed the threshold of significance for homes outside the service area radius of the fire department. However, the change of Unit 37 from open space to a residential use will place Unit 37 farther than the 2 road mile service area of the closest fire station. The mitigation applied to lessen this impact to less than significant for other parcels previously identified as lying outside the 2 road mile radius was the requirement that fire sprinkler systems be installed in structures outside that radius. This mitigation measure would be applied to the residential units built in Unit 37, thus mitigating the potential impact to less than significant.

Another potentially significant impact in the fire suppression activities category was that given the terrain of the project, some residences would be developed upon terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities. The mitigation for this potentially significant impact was that residential dwellings were required to be constructed so that the exterior first floor would be within 150 feet of the public right-of-way. The proposed changes to the project do not affect the developer's obligation or ability to comply with this mitigation measure. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create a new impact in this area.

Finally, the NwRA EIR analyzed potential impacts from new development that may result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department's current emergency Radio Communication System. The developer was required to mitigate this potential impact by installing Radio Repeater towers as needed within the project site. Since Unit 37, at the northern border of the project, is proposed to be developed as residential instead of open space, this may create the need for added/enhanced radio infrastructure in order for fire personnel radio communications systems to function properly when personnel are in working in Unit 37. The Developer will implement the required mitigation by provided radio repeater towers as needed in or around Unit 37, as deemed necessary by the City of Rocklin Fire Department. Therefore, the change in land use and zoning on Unit 37 will not create any new significant impact in this area. The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, and specification of the location of detention basins will have no new significant impacts on fire protection services because these changes do not create the need for additional fire protection.

Schools

The NwRA EIR analyzed the potentially significant impacts to school services, and concluded that although the addition of thousands

of new homes would create an increase demand for school services in the Rocklin Unified School District, the impact could be reduced to less than significant by requiring the developer to dedicate properties for school sites, and to pay fees required by state law. The proposed changes to the project relating to change of general plan land use designation and zoning for several of the properties will have no potential for creating a new impact relating to school services, since the changes result in a net decrease in residential units from 4,373 as previously analyzed to 4,315 as proposed. Since the number of units proposed does not exceed the number previously analyzed, there will be no increase in the number of children needing school facilities, and there may even be a slight reduction in number of children needing school facilities.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and sewer line relocation would have no effect on the number of children added to the city needing school facilities, so these changes will not create any new significant impacts on school services.

#### Parks and Recreation

The NWRA EIR analyzed the potential significant impacts to park and recreation facilities, and concluded that although the addition of thousands of new homes would create an increase demand for park and recreation facilities, the impact could be reduced to less than significant by requiring the developer to dedicate parkland and/or to pay park development fees and other fees required by the City. As discussed above, the developer's proposed GPA and GDP would result in fewer residential units than was previously analyzed, so there would not be any greater demand for parkland due to the land use designation changes and rezones.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II project also proposes to consolidate two neighborhood park sites referred to as Units 46 and 69, consisting of 3.6 and 3.5 acres respectively, into a single 5.5 acre neighborhood park site that is more centrally located within the project. The proposed GPA would redesignate portions of the Unit 46 and 69 sites to residential, equaling a net loss of 1.6 acres of parkland, and the location of the previously analyzed neighborhood parks on Units 46 and 69 are proposed to be located in a slightly different area than analyzed in the NWRA EIR. Even with the decrease in parkland dedicated by Units 46 and 69, the project will still not exceed thresholds of significance related to increase demand for park facilities, because the project will be dedicating a total of 57.2 acres of parkland, exceeding the City of Rocklin General Plan requirement of 56.1 acres of parkland to be provided for this project. The 56.1 acres required is calculated at a required 5 acres of parkland per thousand residents, based on estimated growth of 11,219 new residents added by the 4,315 new dwelling units. Therefore, consolidation, reduction, and relocation of the two park sites will not create any new significant impacts and the project is still obligated to fully comply with required mitigation measures.

The proposed changes to the project related to specification of the location of detention basins, would not increase the need for more park facilities, so this change will not create any new significant impacts on park and recreation facilities.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NWRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NWRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The conclusions reached in the NWRA EIR with respect to the CEQA Initial Study checklist questions for public services (would the NWRA project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities) are no different as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. The analysis within the NWRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
14. Recreation.					
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter K	No	No	No	NA

facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?							
<b>Discussion:</b>	See discussion above under Public Services - Parks and Recreation.						

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>15. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:</b>					
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	Yes FMM-1a&b FMM-2a&b FMM-7a-e FMM-9a-c
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	NA
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	NA
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	NA
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	NA
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	Draft NWRA	No	No	No	NA

g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	EIR Chapter F Draft NWRA EIR Chapter F	No	No	No	Yes FMM-4
--	--	----	----	----	--------------

**Discussion:**

Chapter F – Traffic/Circulation of the NWRA EIR examined the transportation/circulation impacts of the development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NWRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant, and significant and unavoidable impacts on transportation/circulation. Specifically, it concluded that (1) development of the proposed project would increase traffic on intersections in the vicinity of the project but would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) development of the proposed project would increase traffic on roadway segments in the vicinity of the project but this also would be a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures, (3) development of the proposed project could create demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities which would be a less than significant impact, (4) the proposed project would create a demand for transit services which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (5) the omission of school sites from the annexation area could result in traffic congestion in portions of the project site but would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (6) development of school sites could result in on-street parking and parking in residential neighborhoods but would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (7) development of the proposed project would increase traffic on City of Rocklin roadways and at roadway intersections in the vicinity of the project under cumulative conditions resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact, even with mitigation measures, (8) under cumulative conditions, development of the proposed project would create a demand for transit services which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, and (9) development of the proposed project would increase traffic on City of Roseville intersections and roadways and State highways in the vicinity of the project under cumulative conditions resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact even with mitigation measures.

The following table reflects major land uses assumed in the NWRA EIR, proposed changes to the land uses as a part of the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and an identification of the daily automobile trips associated with such changes.

	NWRA EIR	WHITNEY RANCH PHASE II	LAND USE DIFFERENCES	TRIP GENERATION RATE	TRIP GENERATION RATE DIFFERENCES
Single Family Dwelling Units	3,187	2,889	-298	9 trips/dwelling unit	-2,682
Multi-Family Dwelling Units	1,186	1,426	+240	6.5 trips/dwelling unit	+1,560
Business Professional (square feet)	158,100	125,400	-32,700	17.7/1000 square feet	-579
Commercial (square feet)	344,100	401,800	+57,700	35/1000 square feet	+2,020
TOTAL DAILY TRIP DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NWRA AND WHITNEY RANCH PHASE II					+319

As demonstrated in the table above, the Whitney Ranch Phase II project would result in approximately 319 daily trips more than the total number of daily trips assumed in the NWRA EIR. The NWRA EIR assumed a gross total daily trip generation of 129,293 trips



and in comparison to that number, an additional 319 daily trips represents approximately one quarter of one percent (0.246) of the overall trip generation anticipated in the entire 1,874 acre NWRRA area. Because the Whitney Ranch Phase II project has such a minor difference in trip generation and there are no proposed modifications or traffic improvements to the major roadway infrastructure that was analyzed in the NWRRA EIR, the Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not result in new significant traffic impacts nor an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, specification of the location of detention basins, and the sewer line relocation will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on transportation/traffic because these changes do not result in an expected increase in traffic levels. Mitigation measures related to transportation/traffic identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. The analysis within the NWRRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>16. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</b>					
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	No
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	Yes JMM-1 JMM-2 JMM-7
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	No
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	Yes JMM-1 JMM-2
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	No
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	No
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Draft NWRA EIR Chapter J	No	No	No	No

**Discussion:**

Chapter J, Public Utilities of the Draft NwRA EIR analyzed the domestic water, sewer, solid waste disposal, electric, natural gas, telephone and cable television (utilities and service systems) impacts of development of the NwRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area). The EIR acknowledged that development of the NwRA project area (which included the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project area) would have less than significant impacts on public utilities. Specifically, it concluded that (1) the proposed project would increase demand for law enforcement services and facilities in the City of Rocklin which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (2) the proposed project, in combination with future development in the City, would create demand for additional law enforcement services and facilities but this would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (3) the proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection/suppression services and emergency services and this would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (4) the proposed project would increase demand for fire protection/suppression services and emergency services.

The project would require approximately 12 additional fire personnel would be less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (5) the proposed project could result in residential development upon terrain where slopes reduce acceptable fire access for suppression activities would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (6) the proposed project could result in deficiencies within the City of Rocklin Fire Department current emergency Radio Communications System would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (7) the proposed project, in combination with future development in the City, would create demand for additional fire protection, and emergency services would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (8) the proposed project would increase demand for school services in the Rocklin Unified School District would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (9) the proposed project, in combination with future development in the RUSD, would increase demand for school services in the RUSD would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, (10) the proposed project would increase the demand for park facilities would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures, and (11) the proposed project, in combination with other development in the City, would increase the demand for park facilities which would be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures.

The changes contemplated by the revised Project will reduce development of residential units by about 50 homes and increase open space by about 55 acres. Except as previously noted, all existing boundaries for developable areas remain the same except for one small change of 1.4 acres in the former Unit 37. In total, and in light of the overall size of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area, the changes made in the modified Whitney Ranch Phase II area provide for an equivalent amount of development, within the existing

areas previously identified for development, and with no significant relocations or changes to major infrastructure.

The Whitney Ranch Phase II project includes two sewer line/easement alternative alignments in the Kali Place/Detention Basins 13A and 13B area that are different from what was contemplated in the NWRRA EIR. These alternative alignments would also include an all-weather access road, as noted in the NWRRA EIR (The South Placer Municipal Utility District [SPMUD] indicated that if the sewer system were not located in a street but rather in a separate easement, that all-weather access to each manhole would be required). Neither of the optional alignments would involve the removal of a greater number of oak trees than what was previously contemplated in the NWRRA EIR for the same sewer line/easement.

Because the Whitney Ranch Phase II project has is not proposing changes to major utility and service systems infrastructure components that were analyzed in the NWRRA EIR, with the exception of the possible sewer line/easement alternatives described above, the Whitney Ranch Phase II project is not anticipated to result in new significant utility and service system impacts nor an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

The proposed changes to the project related to relocation and merger of parkland parcels, and specification of the location of detention basins will have no new significant impacts nor an increase of a previously identified significant impact on utilities and service systems because these changes do not result in an expected increase in the size and capacity of the utilities and service systems and there would not be a need for upgrades to the utilities and service systems that were previously analyzed in the NWRRA EIR. Mitigation measures related to utilities and service systems identified in the NWRRA EIR are still applicable to the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project.

In conclusion, when comparing the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project to the NWRRA EIR analysis, the anticipated changes associated with the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II GPA and GDP amendments as described above are not anticipated to result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior NWRRA EIR, nor are the changes to the project anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. The conclusions reached in the NWRRA EIR with respect to the CEQA Initial Study checklist questions for utilities and service systems (would the NWRRA project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; have sufficient water supplies available to serve the

project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs, or comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste) are no different as a result of the proposed Whitney Ranch Phase II project. The analysis within the NWRRA EIR is applicable to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project, and no further analysis is required.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Implemented or Address Impacts.
<b>17. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</b>					
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Draft NWRRA EIR Chapter S	No	No	No	NA
b. Does the project have impacts that are	Draft NWRRA	No	No	No	NA

<p>individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>				
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	No	No	No	NA
<p>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	No	No	No	NA
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>The preceding analysis demonstrates that the proposed changes to the Whitney Ranch Phase II project will not involve new significant impacts, that there are not any new circumstances involving new impacts and that there is not any new information requiring new analysis or verification. From these conclusions, it is determined that the Whitney Ranch Phase II project does not require changes to the prior conclusions reached in the certified NWRA EIR and the effects discussed in the Mandatory Findings Checklist section above will not occur beyond those already anticipated in the NWRA EIR as a consequence of the Whitney Ranch Phase II project.</p>				

## **SECTION 4 CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that lead agencies consider the reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects of projects they are considering for approval. Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) have the potential to adversely affect the environment because such emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to global climate change. In turn, global climate change has the potential to result in rising sea levels, which can inundate low-lying areas; to affect rain and snow fall, leading to changes in water supply; to affect habitat, leading to adverse affects on biological resources, etc.

Cumulative impacts are the collective impacts of one or more past, present, and future projects, that, when combined, result in adverse changes to the environment. When the adverse change is substantial, the cumulative impact is considered significant. The cumulative project list for this issue (global climate) comprises anthropogenic (i.e., man-made) GHG emission sources across the entire globe, and no project alone would reasonably be expected to contribute to a noticeable incremental change to the global climate. However, legislation and executive orders on the subject of climate change in California have established a statewide context for GHG emissions, and an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions. Given the nature of environmental consequences from GHGs and global climate change, CEQA requires that the evaluation of the cumulative impacts of GHGs, even relatively small (on a global basis) additions, needs to be considered, and small contributions to this cumulative impact (from which significant affects are occurring and are expected to worsen over time) may be potentially considerable (and therefore, significant). Thus, the City of Rocklin has concluded that GHG emissions require evaluation in CEQA documents.

### **A. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **EXISTING CLIMATE**

Climate is the accumulation of daily and seasonal weather events over a long period of time, whereas weather is defined as the condition of the atmosphere at any particular time and place (Ahrens 2003). The proposed project site is located in a climatic zone characterized as dry-summer subtropical or Mediterranean (abbreviated Cs) on the Köppen climate classification system. The Köppen system's classifications are primarily based on annual and monthly averages of temperature and precipitation.

The Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), of which the City Of Rocklin is part, is relatively flat, bordered by mountains to the east, west, and north. The climate is characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, rainy winters. Periods of dense and persistent low-level fog that are most prevalent between storms are characteristic of SVAB winter weather. The extreme summer aridity of the Mediterranean climate is caused by sinking air of subtropical high pressure regions. In the case of the SVAB, the ocean has less influence than in the coastal areas, giving the interior Mediterranean climate more seasonal temperature variation (Ahrens 2003).

Most precipitation in the area results from air masses that move in from the Pacific Ocean during the winter months. These storms usually move from the west or northwest. More than half the total annual precipitation falls during the winter rainy season (November–February); the average winter temperature is a moderate 49 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). During the summer, daily temperatures range from 50°F to more than 100°F. The inland location and surrounding mountains shelter the area from many of the ocean breezes that keep the coastal regions moderate in temperature.

Local climate of the project site is represented by measurements recorded at the Sacramento station. The normal annual precipitation, which occurs primarily from November through March, is approximately 18 inches. January temperatures range from a normal minimum of 38°F to a normal maximum of 53°F. July temperatures range from a normal minimum of 58°F to a normal maximum of 93°F (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] 1992). The predominant wind direction and speed is from the south-southwest at 10 miles per hour (mph) (California Air Resources Board [ARB] 1994).

#### **ATTRIBUTING CLIMATE CHANGE – THE PHYSICAL SCIENTIFIC BASIS**

Various gases in the earth's atmosphere, classified as GHGs, play a critical role in determining the earth's surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth's atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth's surface, and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth, not as high-frequency solar radiation, but lower frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to temperature. The earth has a much lower temperature than the sun; therefore, the earth emits lower frequency radiation. Most solar radiation passes through GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead "trapped," resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the Greenhouse Effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on Earth. Without the Greenhouse Effect, Earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants (CAPs) and toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are pollutants of regional



and local concern. Whereas pollutants with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about 1 day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (1 year to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the globe. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that more CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, and other forms of sequestration. Of the total annual human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, approximately 54% is sequestered through ocean uptake, uptake by northern hemisphere forest regrowth, and other terrestrial sinks within a year, whereas the remaining 46% of human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions remains stored in the atmosphere (Seinfeld and Pandis 1998).

Similarly, impacts of GHGs are borne globally, as opposed to localized air quality effects of CAPs and TACs. The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; suffice to say, the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would be expected to measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature, or to global, local, or micro climate. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

#### **Feedback Mechanisms and Uncertainty**

Many complex mechanisms interact within Earth's energy budget to establish the global average temperature and global and regional climate conditions. For example, increases in atmospheric temperature would lead to increases in ocean temperature. As atmospheric and ocean temperatures increase, sea ice and glaciers are expected to melt, adding more fresh water to the ocean and altering salinity conditions. Both increases in ocean temperature and changes in salinity would be expected to lead to changes in circulation of ocean currents. Changes in current circulation would further alter ocean temperatures and alter terrestrial climates where currents have changed. Several interacting atmospheric, climatic, hydrologic, and terrestrial factors affecting global climate change are described below. These factors result in feedback mechanisms that could potentially increase or decrease the effects of global climate change. There is uncertainty about how some factors may affect global climate change because they have the potential to both intensify and neutralize future climate warming. Examples of these conditions are described below.

#### **Direct and Indirect Effects of Aerosols**

Aerosols, including particulate matter, reflect sunlight back to space. As air quality goals for particulate matter are met and fewer emissions of particulate matter occur, the cooling effect of aerosols would be reduced, and the Greenhouse Effect would be further intensified. Similarly, aerosols act as cloud condensation nuclei, aiding in cloud formation and increasing cloud lifetime. Under some circumstances (see discussion of the cloud effect below), clouds efficiently reflect solar radiation back to space. With a

reduction in emissions of particulate matter, including aerosols, the direct and indirect positive effect of aerosols on clouds would be reduced, potentially further amplifying the Greenhouse Effect.

#### **The Cloud Effect**

As global temperature rises, the ability of the air to hold moisture increases, facilitating cloud formation. As stated above, clouds can efficiently reflect solar radiation back to space. If an increase in cloud cover occurs at low or middle altitudes, resulting in clouds with greater liquid water content, such as stratus or cumulus clouds, more radiation would be reflected back to space than under current conditions. This would result in a negative feedback mechanism, in which the increase in cloud cover resulting from global climate change acts to balance the amount of further warming. If clouds form at higher altitudes in the form of cirrus clouds, however, these clouds allow more solar radiation to pass through than they reflect and ultimately act as GHGs themselves. This results in a positive feedback mechanism, in which the side effect of global climate change (an increase in cloud cover) acts to intensify the warming process. Because of the conflicting feedback mechanisms to which increasing cloud cover can contribute, this cloud effect is an area of relatively high uncertainty for scientists when projecting future global climate change conditions.

#### **Other Feedback Mechanisms**

As global temperature continues to rise, CH<sub>4</sub> gas trapped in permafrost is expected to be released into the atmosphere. As identified below in the description of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, CH<sub>4</sub> is approximately 23 times as efficient a GHG as CO<sub>2</sub>; therefore, this release of CH<sub>4</sub> would accelerate and intensify global climate change if current trends continue. Additionally, as the surface area of polar and sea ice continues to diminish, Earth's albedo, or reflectivity, also is anticipated to decrease. More incoming solar radiation likely will be absorbed by the earth rather than be reflected back into space, further intensifying the Greenhouse Effect and associated global climate change. These and other both positive and negative feedback mechanisms are still being studied by the scientific community to better understand their potential effects on global climate change. The specific incremental increase in global average temperature that will result from the interaction of all the pertinent variables has not been pinpointed at this time. Although the amount and rate of increase in global average temperature are uncertain, there is no longer much debate within the scientific community that global climate change is occurring and that human-caused GHG emissions are contributing to this phenomenon.

#### **ATTRIBUTING CLIMATE CHANGE - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION SOURCES**

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors (California Energy Commission [CEC] 2006a). In

California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (CEC 2006a). Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. CH<sub>4</sub>, a highly potent GHG, results from off-gassing (the release of chemicals from nonmetallic substances under ambient or greater pressure conditions) is largely associated with agricultural practices and landfills. CO<sub>2</sub> sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, which absorb CO<sub>2</sub> through sequestration and dissolution, respectively, two of the most common processes of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration.

California is the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub> in the world (CEC 2006a). California produced 499 million gross metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) in 2004 (ARB 2007a). CO<sub>2</sub>e is a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the Greenhouse Effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential (GWP) of a GHG, is dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. For example, as described in Appendix C, "Calculation References," of the General Reporting Protocol of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR 2007), 1 ton of CH<sub>4</sub> has the same contribution to the Greenhouse Effect as approximately 23 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, CH<sub>4</sub> is a much more potent GHG than CO<sub>2</sub>. Expressing emissions in CO<sub>2</sub>e takes the contributions of all GHG emissions to the Greenhouse Effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO<sub>2</sub> were being emitted.

Combustion of fossil fuel in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2004, accounting for 41% of total GHG emissions in the state (CEC 2006a). This sector was followed by the electric power sector (including both in-state and out-of-state sources) (22%) and the industrial sector (21%) (CEC 2006a).

#### **ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE**

According to the IPCC, which was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme, global average temperature is expected to increase by 3–7°F by the end of the century, depending on future GHG emission scenarios (IPCC 2007). Resource areas other than air quality and atmospheric temperature could be indirectly affected by the accumulation of GHG emissions. For example, an increase in the global average temperature is expected to result in a decreased volume of precipitation falling as snow in California and an overall reduction in snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. Snowpack in the Sierra Nevada provides both water supply (runoff) and storage (within the snowpack before melting), which is a major source of supply for the state (including the project site). According to the California Energy Commission (2006b), the snowpack portion of the water supply could potentially decline by 30–90% by the end of the 21st century. A study cited in a report by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) projects that approximately 50% of the statewide snowpack will be lost by the end of the century (Knowles and Cayan 2002). Although current forecasts are uncertain, it is evident that this phenomenon could lead to significant challenges in securing an adequate water supply for a growing

population. An increase in precipitation falling as rain rather than snow also could lead to increased potential for floods because water that would normally be held in the Sierra Nevada until spring could flow into the Central Valley concurrently with winter storm events. This scenario would place more pressure on California's levee/flood control system (DWR 2006).

Another outcome of global climate change is sea level rise. Sea level rose approximately 7 inches during the last century (CEC 2006b), and it is predicted to rise an additional 7–22 inches by 2100, depending on the future levels of GHG emissions (IPCC 2007). If this occurs, resultant effects could include increased coastal flooding, saltwater intrusion (especially a concern in the low-lying Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta, where pumps delivering potable water could be threatened), and disruption of wetlands (CEC 2006b). As the existing climate throughout California changes over time, the ranges of various plant and wildlife species could shift or be reduced, depending on the favored temperature and moisture regimes of each species. In the worst cases, some species would become extinct or be extirpated from the state if suitable conditions are no longer available.

The project site is situated approximately 320 feet above sea level and, thus, would not be directly affected by the potential sea level rise predicted to occur over the next 100 years. However, low-lying populated portions of the Sacramento area to the west of Rocklin (less than 50 km away) could experience increased flooding and associated displacement of residents and businesses due to rising sea levels.

Nor would potential effects of global warming on the Sierra snowpack be expected to adversely affect the water supply for the project, which would build out quickly after getting its approvals from the City, and come to an agreement shortly thereafter with Placer County Water Authority (PCWA) for a committed water supply for operation of the project going forward. Although global climate change is projected to reduce the size of the annual Sierra Nevada snowpack, and thereby generally adversely affect water resources in California, any measureable change will not be felt until long after the project proponents have reached their agreement with PCWA. Furthermore, the practical consequences of a reduced snowpack are not known, and predictions involve speculation.

Notably, Placer County, in conducting environmental review for the recently adopted Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, conducted an extensive literature review of various scholarly studies on the subject, and found the results to be inconclusive. Despite the very significant water demand created by the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, however, the County ultimately concluded that the effects on climate change on PCWA's water supplies – and particularly those devoted to municipal and industrial uses – would be less than significant in light of studies indicating that, to the extent California suffers a reduced overall water supply due to global warming, the effects will be felt most acutely south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and especially in agricultural areas. (*Second*

*Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIR*, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, pp. 4.13-18 – 4.13-28 and appendix A (2007).) Here, because the same water provider (PCWA) is involved, because the Rocklin Whitney Ranch Phase II project will consume far less water than will be consumed by the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, and because the Rocklin Whitney Ranch Phase II project can be served by an existing supply (the American River Pump Station) rather than an anticipated future supply (the proposed Sacramento River Diversion which would supply Placer Vineyards), the City concludes that the effects of global warming on PCWA's water supplies will not be significant with respect to Rocklin Whitney Ranch Phase II. The City does not depend solely on the Placer Vineyards documentation for that conclusion, however, but has reached that determination on its own. (See especially, Medellin et al., *Climate Warming and Water Supply Management in California*. California Climate Change Center, State of California. White Paper CEC-500-2005-195-SF, March.)

## **B. REGULATORY SETTING**

### **FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS; ATMOSPHERIC GREENHOUSE GASES**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the federal agency responsible for implementing the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled on April 2, 2007 that CO<sub>2</sub> is an air pollutant as defined under the CAA, and that EPA has the authority to regulate emissions of GHGs. However, there are no federal regulations or policies regarding GHG emissions applicable to the proposed project at the time of writing.

### **STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS**

ARB is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), which was adopted in 1988.

#### **Atmospheric Greenhouse Gases**

Various statewide and local initiatives to reduce the state's contribution to GHG emissions have raised awareness that, even though the various contributors to and consequences of global climate change are not yet fully understood, global climate change is under way, and there is a real potential for severe adverse environmental, social, and economic effects in the long term. Because every nation emits GHGs and therefore makes an incremental cumulative contribution to global climate change, cooperation on a global scale will be required to reduce the rate of GHG emissions to a level that can help to slow or stop the human-caused increase in average global temperatures and associated changes in climatic conditions.

**Assembly Bill 1493**

In 2002, then-Governor Gray Davis signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 (Stats. 2002, ch. 200) (amending Health & Safety Code, § 42823 and adding Health & Safety Code, § 43018.5). AB 1493 requires that ARB develop and adopt, by January 1, 2005, regulations that achieve “the maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks and other vehicles determined by ARB to be vehicles whose primary use is noncommercial personal transportation in the state.”

To meet the requirements of AB 1493, in 2004 ARB approved amendments to the California Code of Regulations (CCR) adding GHG emissions standards to California’s existing standards for motor vehicle emissions. Amendments to CCR Title 13, Sections 1900 and 1961 (13 CCR §§ 1900, 1961), and adoption of Section 1961.1 (13 CCR § 1961.1) require automobile manufacturers to meet fleet-average GHG emissions limits for all passenger cars, light-duty trucks within various weight criteria, and medium-duty passenger vehicle weight classes (i.e., any medium-duty vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating less than 10,000 pounds that is designed primarily for the transportation of persons), beginning with the 2009 model year. Emissions limits are reduced further in each model year through 2016. Emissions requirements adopted as part of 13 CCR § 1961.1 are shown in Table 6-15. For passenger cars and light-duty trucks with a loaded vehicle weight (LVW) of 3,750 pounds or less, the GHG emission limits for the 2016 model year are approximately 37% lower than the limits for the first year of the regulations, the 2009 model year. For light-duty trucks with LVW of 3,751 pounds to gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 8,500 pounds, as well as medium-duty passenger vehicles, GHG emissions are reduced approximately 24% between 2009 and 2016.

Vehicle Model Year	Fleet-Average Greenhouse Gas Emissions (CO <sub>2</sub> e in grams per mile)	
	Passenger Cars and Light-Duty Trucks 0–3,750 Pounds LVW	Medium-Duty Passenger Vehicles and Light- Duty Trucks 3,751 Pounds LVW to 8,500 Pounds GVW
2009	323	439
2010	301	420
2011	267	390
2012	233	361
2013	227	355
2014	222	350
2015	213	341
2016	205	332

**Table 6-15  
Fleet-Average Greenhouse Gas Exhaust Emission Limits Included In CCR 13 1961.1**

Vehicle Model Year	Fleet-Average Greenhouse Gas Emissions (CO <sub>2</sub> e in grams per mile)	
	Passenger Cars and Light-Duty Trucks 0–3,750 Pounds LVW	Medium-Duty Passenger Vehicles and Light- Duty Trucks 3,751 Pounds LVW to 8,500 Pounds GVW
Notes:		
GVW = gross vehicle weight.		
LVW = loaded vehicle weight.		
* Specific characteristics of passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles are provided in Title 13, Section 1900 of the California Code of Regulations as amended to comply with Assembly Bill 1493.		
Source: California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Section 1961.1		

In December 2004, a group of car dealerships, automobile manufacturers, and trade groups representing automobile manufacturers filed suit against ARB to prevent enforcement of 13 CCR Sections 1900 and 1961 as amended by AB 1493 and 13 CCR 1961.1 (*Central Valley Chrysler-Jeep et al. v. Catherine E. Witherspoon, in Her Official Capacity as Executive Director of the California Air Resources Board, et al.*). The suit, still in process in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California contends that California’s implementation of regulations that, in effect, regulate vehicle fuel economy violates various federal laws, regulations, and policies. To date, the suit has not been settled, and the judge has issued an injunction stating that ARB cannot enforce the regulations in question before receiving appropriate authorization from EPA.

In January 2007, the judge hearing the case accepted a request from the State Attorney General’s office that the trial be postponed until a decision is reached by the U.S. Supreme Court on a separate case addressing GHGs. In the Supreme Court case, *Massachusetts, et al., v. Environmental Protection Agency, et al.*, the primary issue in question was whether the CAA provides authority for EPA to regulate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. EPA contended that the CAA does not authorize regulation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, whereas Massachusetts and 10 other states, including California, sued EPA to begin regulating CO<sub>2</sub>. As mentioned above, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on April 2, 2007, that GHGs are “air pollutants” as defined under the CAA and EPA is granted authority to regulate CO<sub>2</sub> (*Massachusetts v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* [2007] 549 U.S. 05-1120).

**Executive Order S-3-05**

Executive Order S-3-05, which was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It declares that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra’s snowpack, further exacerbate California’s air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To combat

No air district in California, including the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), has formally adopted a significance threshold for GHG emissions generated by a proposed project, or a methodology for analyzing impacts related to GHG emissions or global climate change. By adoption of AB 32 and SB 97, however, the State of California has established GHG reduction targets and has determined that GHG emissions as they relate to global climate change are a source of adverse environmental impacts in California. Although AB 32 did not amend CEQA, the legislation does include language identifying the various environmental problems in California caused by global warming (Health & Saf. Code, § 38501(a).) SB 97, in contrast, did amend CEQA to require the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare CEQA Guidelines revisions addressing the mitigation of GHGs or their consequences. OPR subsequently issued a recommendation framework in their recent technical memorandum titled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, June 19, 2008.

In any event, the proper context for addressing the issue in an EIR is the discussion of cumulative impacts, since while the emissions of one single project will not cause global climate change, GHG emissions from multiple projects throughout the world could result in a cumulative impact with respect to global climate change.

To meet GHG emission targets of AB 32, California would need to generate in the future less GHG emissions than current levels. It is recognized, however, that for most projects there is no simple metric available to determine if a single project would substantially increase or decrease overall GHG emission levels or conflict with the goals of AB 32.

Although the text of AB 32 strongly suggests that, when ARB interprets and applies the definition of "Greenhouse gas emission source," the regulations promulgated pursuant to the legislation will apply primarily, if not exclusively, to stationary sources of GHG emissions (see Health & Safety Code, § 38505(i)), this mandate demonstrates California's commitment to reducing the rate of GHG emissions and the state's associated contribution to climate change, without intent to limit population or economic growth within the state. Thus, to achieve the goals of AB 32, which are tied to GHG emission rates of specific benchmark years (i.e., 1990), California would have to achieve a lower rate of emissions per unit of population (per person) than it has now. Further, in order to accommodate future population and economic growth, the state would have to achieve an even lower rate of emissions per unit than was achieved in 1990. (The goal to achieve 1990 quantities of GHG emissions by 2020 means that this will need to be accomplished with 30 years of population and economic growth beyond 1990 in place.) Thus, future planning efforts that would not encourage reductions in GHG emissions would conflict with the policy decisions contained in the spirit of AB 32, thus impeding California's ability to comply with the mandate.

While the text of AB 32 focuses on major stationary and area sources of GHG emissions, the primary objective of AB 32 is to reduce California's contribution to global warming



by reducing California's total annual production of GHG emissions. The impact that GHG emissions have on global climate change is not dependent on whether they were generated by stationary, mobile, or area sources, or whether they were generated in one region or another.

#### **ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

There is no methodology formally adopted by any air district or state agency for evaluating GHG emissions from new development. It is important to note that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from project operation may not necessarily be considered "new" emissions, given that a project itself does not create "new" emitters (people) of GHGs, at least not in the traditional sense. In other words, the GHG emissions for a commercial project are not necessarily new GHG emissions; to a large degree, a commercial project relocates GHG emissions from one part of a market shed to another; similarly, a residential project does not create people (emitters), but accommodates them as they move from one location to another. In this sense, commercial and residential development projects occur in response to increased demand from the growing economy and population, and are not in themselves creators of economic and population growth. Emissions of GHGs are, however, influenced by the location and design of projects, to the extent that they can influence travel to and from the projects, and to the degree the projects are designed to maximize energy efficiency.

The use of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has been suggested by some as a step to quantify greenhouse gas emissions. No accepted, technically sound methodology exists that would allow the City to determine how many vehicle trips, or vehicle miles traveled, associated with the project, as determined through the traffic models used in the NWRA EIR are truly "new" trips, as opposed to trips coming to and from the project site instead of traveling to and from some other site or sites, or "new" VMT. Residential development typically has an associated average daily trip generation rate that assumes work-related, shopping-related, and other types of trips occur on a daily basis originating and ending at the residential unit. It is reasonable to assume that these trips would occur without the proposed project, especially in a region as well-developed as southern Placer County.

Thus, the consistency with the state's requirements for GHG emissions reductions is the best metric for determining whether the proposed project would contribute to global warming in a substantial manner which would be characterized as a significant cumulative impact. The City has compiled an extensive inventory of recommended GHG emissions strategies from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), the California Association of Air Pollution Control Officers (CAPCOA), the California Climate Action Team's (CAT) report to the Governor, the Association of Environmental Professionals, and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. In the following section the City will analyze all GHG emissions strategies which will be required of the

Project through city wide policies, conditions of project approval, air quality and other environmental mitigation measures, and project design features to determine the Project's compliance with the state mandate to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

#### **D. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Long-term operation of the proposed project would generate associated GHG emissions from area- and mobile-sources, and indirectly from stationary sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source emissions of GHGs would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with employee commute, vendor, and shopping (i.e., visitor) trips to the project site. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance of proposed land uses, natural gas distribution for space and water heating, and other sources. Increases in stationary-source emissions could occur at off-site utility providers associated with electricity and natural gas consumption by the proposed uses.

GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would predominantly consist of CO<sub>2</sub>. In comparison to CAPs (criteria air pollutants), such as ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions persist in the atmosphere for a substantially longer period of time. While emissions of other GHGs, such as CH<sub>4</sub>, are important with respect to global climate change, emission levels of other GHGs are less dependent on the land use and circulation patterns associated with the proposed land use development project than are levels of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Mobile sources (vehicle trips and associated miles traveled) would be the primary emission source of GHGs associated with the proposed project. Transportation is also the largest source of GHG emissions in California and represents approximately 41% of annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions generated in the state (CEC 2006a). Problematically, using standard traffic engineering methodologies that treat all trips to and from a project site as a "net increase" or "new" trips and all VMT associated with the project as "new" VMT, is appropriate for localized and regional air quality or traffic analyses, where the location of CAP emissions within a distinct air basin or impacts to the local roadway network, respectively, are important. However, given a statewide context through legislation for a global impact, it would be inappropriate to assess GHG emissions in the same manner as for air quality or traffic.

It is important to consider the context for GHG emissions. GHG emissions are dispersed throughout the atmosphere worldwide, and the effects of climate change are borne globally, unlike CAP emissions, which have regional and/or local impacts on air quality. As noted earlier, the extent to which GHG emissions attributable to the project can be treated as "new" is uncertain. For this reason and others discussed above in the section describing methods for analysis, it is more relevant to consider the GHG-efficiency of a project rather than simply the mass of GHG emissions.

Though transportation is the predominant single source of GHG emissions in California, emissions generated by other sectors (e.g., energy, industry, agriculture) are also important and should not be overlooked. Stationary- and mobile-source measures and regulations on the horizon would assist in further lowering project GHG emissions. It is not known at this time what reductions are achievable from other emission sources through measures such as the AB 32 Early Action Measures (adopted in July and October 2007), which primarily target high GWP GHGs. Also not known at this time is whether additional GHG reductions for mobile sources might be available through legislation such as AB 1493, which would create more stringent vehicle emission standards for GHGs. It is not yet clear what the net GHG emissions of the project would actually be under the buildout scenario, given the uncertainty of future legislative actions. Therefore, actual CO<sub>2</sub> emission rates and reduction requirements from land use development projects could vary. Nonetheless, some amount of GHG emission reductions would be required of the Project to achieve AB 32 targets.

#### **E. PROJECT EFFECTS ON GLOBAL CLIMATE**

The primary source of GHGs in California is fossil fuel combustion. The primary GHG associated with fuel combustion is carbon dioxide, with lesser amounts of methane and nitrous oxide. The project would result in emissions of these GHGs due to fuel combustion in motor vehicles and building heating systems associated with the project. Building and motor vehicle air conditioning systems may use HFCs and (HCFCs and CFCs to the extent that they have not been completely phased out at later dates), which may result in emissions through leaks. The other GHGs (perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride) are associated with specific industrial sources and are not expected to be associated with the proposed project.

While the project would result in emissions of GHGs, the significance of the impact of a single project on global climate cannot be determined for a couple of reasons: First, no guidance currently exists to indicate what level of GHG emissions would be considered substantial enough to result in a significant project-level impact on global climate. Second, available global climate change models are not sensitive enough to be able to predict the effect of a single project on global temperatures and the resultant effect on climate; therefore, they cannot be used to evaluate the significance of a project's impact. Thus, insufficient information and predictive tools exist to assess whether a single project would result in a significant impact on global climate. For these reasons, determining the significance of the project's impact on global climate would involve undue speculation.

Furthermore, global climate change is in essence a result of cumulative emissions of GHGs and therefore the appropriate manner in which to evaluate the project's effect is to

determine whether the project's contribution to global climate change would be considerable. Once again, the tools to evaluate the significance of the contribution do not exist at this time. No quantitative emission thresholds or similar criteria have been established and formally adopted to evaluate whether a single project's contribution to the cumulative global climate change impact would be considerable. In the absence of a criterion, the contribution of the project is discussed below qualitatively and no conclusion as to its significance is drawn in this Addendum as that would involve undue speculation.

The GHG emissions from the project would be small compared to globally generated emissions. In fact, California's entire anthropogenic contribution is less than two percent of the global emissions based on 2004 estimates. Therefore, although there are not quantitative thresholds to use, it is noteworthy that the project's contribution as a percentage of global emissions and/or California emissions would be exceedingly small.

Supporting that conclusion is the recent report from ConSol consulting, which is a residential energy management consultant to the building industry. In their report *Carbon Footprint of Single-Family Residential New Construction*, May 2008, ConSol did an analysis of the carbon footprint of an average size 1990 single family home typical of the western states and compared that to the carbon footprint of an average size 2006 single family home. The average house size increased by 15% during that period of time. ConSol then analyzed water heating, space cooling and heating, appliances, lighting, and plug loads to determine a whole house comparison between 1990 and 2006. Their conclusion was that total whole house energy use in homes including heating, cooling, water heating, appliances, lighting, and plug load has decreased 25% since 1990, even after adjusting for the increased home size of the modern residence.

In summary, while the project's GHG emissions prior to mitigation would be small in comparison to global and California emissions, as explained in detail below, a significant number of GHG emissions reduction strategies will be implemented with the Project which will further minimize its GHG emissions.

#### **F. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTION STRATEGIES**

The City recognizes that the Project will result in the generation of area and mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases from the construction and operation of the proposed project. Consistent with the intent of AB 32, the City also recognizes that it has existing programs in place, and others that are planned, that serve to reduce and minimize greenhouse gas emissions.

## **CITYWIDE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES CONTRIBUTING TO REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

The following citywide programs and policies contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions:

1. Participation in Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E) Climate Smart Program – the City agreed to a fixed increase to its monthly PG&E bill to offset the carbon emissions caused by energy used in City facilities.
2. The City passed a resolution supporting the Partnership for Prosperity Clean Technology Initiative to attract clean technology companies.
3. The City is a member of the U.S. Green Building Council, a non-profit organization dedicated to sustainable building design and construction.
4. The City is working towards "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design" (LEED) certification on its Administration and Police Station buildings, with efforts including changes in cleaning practices, cleaning materials and supplies, energy efficiency and indoor environmental quality.
5. The City is a member of Build-It-Green, a non-profit organization focused on providing education and information to individuals and developers of residential projects on ways they can utilize green technology and products to reduce energy usage, save resources, and build a healthier indoor environment.
6. Training for the City's Chief Building Official and Building Inspection Services Manager on green building project certifications and the requirements on how to build green. The City's Chief Building Official is also a member of the steering committee for the region's Build-It Green Agency Council.
7. The City is participating in implementing a universal residential solar program with neighboring jurisdictions to address residential solar programs, develop a standardized fee, and create consistent information resources on green building practices for use on websites. The City hosted a workshop for permit technicians to educate on green building practices and programs and to provide training.
8. The City constructed solar carports at its police station facility, which generate nearly 40% of the annual electricity required to operate the facility.
9. The City hosted a free, two-hour "Solar Saturday" workshop to provide information and education to residents on residential solar technology, and will be hosting a similar workshop for developers.
10. In 1998, the City's Public Works Department initiated a project to replace traffic signal lights (incandescent bulbs) with Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs). This project was completed in 2001 and all new traffic signal lights come standard with LED bulbs.
11. In 1998, the City Council approved a plan to reduce water use in city street landscaping by removing turf and replacing it with drought-tolerant plants. The Public Works Department is continuing its program to reduce water use through turf removal/plant replacement, and requiring developers to plant drought-tolerant plants and install drip irrigation along streetscapes in new projects.

**Table 1  
Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy and Description	Project Compliance
<b>California Air Resources Board</b>	
<p><b>Vehicle Climate Change Standards</b>            AB 1493 (Pavley) required the State to develop and adopt regulations that achieve the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of climate change emissions emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. Regulations were adopted by the CARB in September 2004.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.            This measure applies to passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. The project does not manufacture, sale or purchase these vehicles. Vehicles that access the site would be required to be in compliance with applicable State and federal regulations.</p>
<p><b>Other Light Duty Vehicle Technology</b>            New standards would be adopted to phase in beginning in the 2017 model year</p>	<p>Not Applicable.            The project does not manufacture, sale or purchase light duty vehicles. Light duty trucks that access the site would be required to be in compliance with applicable State and federal regulations.</p>
<p><b>Diesel Anti-Idling</b>            In July 2004, the CARB adopted a measure to limit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicle idling.</p>	<p>Compliant.            The proposed project would be required to comply with CARB limits on diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicle idling.</p>
<p><b>Hydrofluorocarbon Reduction</b>            (1) Ban retail sale of HFC in small cans. (2) Require that only low GWP refrigerants be used in new vehicular systems. (3) Adopt specifications for new commercial refrigeration. (4) Add refrigerant leak-tightness to the pass criteria for vehicular inspection and maintenance programs. (5) Enforce federal ban on releasing HFCs.</p>	<p>Compliant.            The proposed project would be required to comply with the specific strategies applicable to retail uses once they are adopted. For example, the retail sale of HFC's in small cans would be prohibited at the retail stores within the project site. However, the majority of these strategies would not be applicable to the proposed project.</p>
<p><b>Transportation Refrigeration Units (TRUs), Off-Road Electrification, Port Electrification</b>            Strategies to reduce emissions from TRUs, increase off-road electrification, and increase use of shore-side/port electrification.</p>	<p>Compliant.            Through the Design Review entitlement process for commercial projects, the project would be conditioned to restrict the use of TRU's on the project site.</p>
<p><b>Manure Management</b>            Strategies to reduce volatile organic compounds from confined animal facilities.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Alternative Fuels: Biodiesel Blends</b>            CARB would develop regulations to require the use of 1 to 4 percent biodiesel displacement of California diesel fuel.</p>	<p>Not Applicable            The proposed project does not include any fuel-dispensing facilities at this time. However, if a fuel-dispensing facility is proposed on the site in the future, it would be required to comply with CARB regulations regarding the inclusion of alternative fuels.</p>

<b>Table 1 Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies</b>	
<b>Strategy and Description</b>	<b>Project Compliance</b>
<p><b>Alternative Fuels: Ethanol</b> Increased use of ethanol fuel.</p>	<p>Not Applicable The proposed project does not include any fuel-dispensing facilities at this time. However, if a fuel-dispensing facility is proposed on the site in the future, it would be required to comply with CARB regulations regarding the inclusion of alternative fuels.</p>
<p><b>Heavy-Duty Vehicle Emission Reduction Measures</b> Increased efficiency in the design of heavy-duty vehicles and an education program for the heavy-duty vehicle sector.</p>	<p>Not Applicable The proposed project would not include any activities associated with the design of vehicles and would not include heavy-duty vehicle education programs.</p>
<p><b>Reduced Venting and Leaks in Oil and Gas Systems</b> Rule considered for adoption by the Air Pollution Control Districts for improved management practices.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Hydrogen Highway</b> The California Hydrogen Highway Network (CA H2 Net) is a State initiative to promote the use of hydrogen as a means of diversifying the sources of transportation energy.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Achieve 50 Percent Statewide Recycling Goal</b> Achieving the State's 50 percent waste diversion mandate as established by the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, (AB 939, Sher, Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989), will reduce climate change emissions associated with energy-intensive material extraction and production as well as methane emission from landfills. A diversion rate of 48 percent has been achieved on a statewide basis. Therefore, a 2 percent additional reduction is needed.</p>	<p>Compliant. The City of Rocklin diverts over 50% of the solid waste generated within the City from landfill disposal, consistent with the requirements of AB 939. The majority of this diversion takes place at the Western Regional Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Placer County. The MRF recovers recyclable materials such as glass, metals, paper, plastics, wood waste and other compostable materials. Solid waste generated from the proposed project would be delivered to the MRF. Therefore the proposed project would be consistent with this strategy.</p>
<p><b>Landfill Methane Capture</b> Install direct gas use or electricity projects at landfills to capture and use emitted methane.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<b>Department of Forestry</b>	

**Table 1  
Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy and Description	Project Compliance
<p><b>Urban Forestry</b> A new statewide goal of planting 5 million trees in urban areas by 2020 would be achieved through the expansion of local urban forestry programs.</p>	<p>Compliant. The site's Landscaping Plan would be required to comply with the City's parking lot shade requirements, which would require extensive tree planting on the site. In addition, the City has adopted an Urban Forest Plan with specific strategies for expanding tree canopy within the City. The City's Urban Forest Plan has shown that development in the City that is consistent with City General Plan policies has resulted in an increase of tree canopy cover from 11% in 1952 to 18% in 2003 (a 63% increase). The Urban Forest Plan provides a framework for the City to maintain its existing tree canopy cover and to increase it to a greater extent as development continues.</p>
<p><b>Reforestation Projects</b> Reforestation projects focus on restoring native tree cover on lands that were previously forested and are now covered with other vegetative types.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Department of Water Resources</b></p>	
<p><b>Water Use Efficiency</b> Approximately 19 percent of all electricity, 30 percent of all natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel are used to convey, treat, distribute and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Compliant. The project's landscape plan will be required by the City to include an automatic irrigation system, and the use of drip system irrigation will be encouraged as applicable. The project's landscape plan is also required by the City to be certified by the landscape architect as meeting the requirements of the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act (Government Code Section 65591, et. seq.). Future community buildings will utilize water-conserving plumbing fixtures such as sensor-activated low flow faucets and toilets. Low flow faucets are known to reduce water usage by up to 84% percent.</p>
<p><b>Energy Commission (CEC)</b></p>	
<p><b>Building Energy Efficiency Standards in Place and in Progress</b> Public Resources Code 25402 authorizes the CEC to adopt and periodically update its building energy efficiency standards (that apply to newly constructed buildings and additions to and alterations to existing buildings).</p>	<p>Compliant. Construction and operation of all of the proposed buildings on the site would be required to comply with the energy efficiency standards included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 24 identifies specific energy efficiency requirements for building construction and systems operations that are intended to ensure efficient energy usage over the long-term life of the building.</p>



**Table 1  
Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy and Description	Project Compliance
<p><b>Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards in Place and in Progress</b> Public Resources Code 25402 authorizes the Energy Commission to adopt and periodically update its appliance energy efficiency standards (that apply to devices and equipment using energy that are sold or offered for sale in California).</p>	<p>Compliant. The appliances installed at the project site would be required to comply with all applicable Energy Commission requirements related to energy efficiency.</p>
<p><b>Cement Manufacturing</b> Cost-effective reductions to reduce energy consumption and to lower carbon dioxide emissions in the cement industry.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Municipal Utility Strategies</b> Includes energy efficiency programs, renewable portfolio standard, combined heat and power, and transitioning away from carbon-intensive generation.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Alternative Fuels: Non-Petroleum Fuels</b> Increasing the use of non-petroleum fuels in California's transportation sector, as recommended in the CEC's 2003 and 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Reports.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Business Transportation and Housing</b></p>	
<p><b>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)</b> Smart land use strategies encourage jobs/housing proximity, promote transit-oriented development, and encourage high-density residential/commercial development along transit corridors. ITS is the application of advanced technology systems and management strategies to improve operational efficiency of transportation systems and movement of people, goods, and services. Governor Schwarzenegger is finalizing a comprehensive 10-year strategic growth plan with the intent of developing ways to promote, through State investments, incentives and technical assistance, land use, and technology strategies that provide for a prosperous economy, social equity, and a quality environment. Smart land use, demand management, ITS, and value pricing are critical elements in this plan for improving mobility and transportation efficiency. Specific strategies include promoting jobs/housing proximity and transit-oriented</p>	<p>Compliant. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable City of Rocklin General Plan policies that encourage smart land use development. These policies include the following: Circulation Element, Policy 3 – "To require bike lanes in the design and construction of major new street and highway improvements, and to establish bike lanes on those City streets wide enough to accommodate bicycles safely." There are over 6 miles of Class 1, and 8 miles of Class 2 bike lanes in the project. Circulation Element, Policy 6 – "To promote pedestrian convenience through development conditions requiring sidewalks, walking paths, or hiking trails that connect residential areas with commercial, shopping and employment centers." The project includes several features to promote pedestrian convenience, including sidewalks, pedestrian and bike trails, and ADA-compliant paths of travel. Circulation Element, Policy 10 – "To promote the use of public transit through development conditions requiring park-and-ride lots, bus turnouts and passenger shelters along major streets." The</p>

**Table 1  
Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy and Description	Project Compliance
development; encouraging high-density residential/commercial development along transit/rail corridor; valuing and congestion pricing; implementing intelligent transportation systems, traveler information/traffic control, and incident management; accelerating the development of broadband infrastructure; and comprehensive, integrated, multimodal/intermodal transportation planning.	project would be subject to a mitigation measure that promotes transit enhancing infrastructure that includes transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.  Also, the project includes neighborhood commercial services and general retail provided in a single shopping center. Such variation in commercial services allows for more efficient shopping practices and fewer vehicle trips.
<b>Measures to Improve Transportation Energy Efficiency</b> Builds on current efforts to provide a framework for expanded and new initiatives, including incentives, tools, and information that advance cleaner transportation and reduce climate change emissions.	Compliant. The proposed project includes project design features that will implement fuel conservation measures that encourage the use of public transportation, bicycle use and pedestrian access.
<b>Department of Food and Agriculture</b>	
<b>Enteric Fermentation</b> Cattle emit methane from digestion processes. Changes in diet could result in a reduction in emissions.	Not Applicable
<b>State and Consumer Services Agency</b>	
<b>Green Buildings Initiative</b> Green Building Executive Order, S-20-04 (CA 2004), sets a goal of reducing energy use in public and private buildings by 20 percent by the year 2015, as compared with 2003 levels. The Executive Order and related action plan spell out specific actions State agencies are to take with State-owned and -leased buildings. The order and plan also discuss various strategies and incentives to encourage private building owners and operators to achieve the 20 percent target.	Compliant. As discussed above, the project is initiating energy efficient building design measures that are intended to minimize building energy demands.
<b>Public Utilities Commission (PUC)</b>	
<b>Accelerated Renewable Portfolio Standard</b> The Governor has set a goal of achieving 33 percent renewables in the State's resource mix by 2020. The joint PUC/Energy Commission September 2005 Energy Action Plan II (EAP II) adopts the 33 percent goal.	Not Applicable

<b>Table 1 Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies</b>	
<b>Strategy and Description</b>	<b>Project Compliance</b>
<b>Investor-Owned Utility</b> This strategy includes energy efficiency programs, combined heat and power initiative, and electricity sector carbon policy for investor owned utility.	Not Applicable
Source: Summarized from CAT 2006, MBA 2006.	

**PROJECT SPECIFIC GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTION STRATEGIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE NORTHWEST ROCKLIN ANNEXATION AREA AND WHITNEY RANCH PHASE II**

The City also recognizes that, in addition to the project features identified in Table 1 above, the project itself includes mitigating features implementing mitigation measures GMM1(a) and (b) and GMM2(a) through (g) from the Air Quality section of the NWRA EIR and the Project conditions of approval that are beneficial in terms of minimizing greenhouse gas emissions. The greenhouse gas emissions reduction features are identified in the following list:

1. The project’s overall master plan includes a mix of land uses and public facilities like parks and schools. This will encourage walking, bicycling, and shorter drives to services and employment center.
2. The project incorporates a significant number of tree plantings within parks, open space, project entries and arterial and other road corridors.
3. The project incorporates over 6 miles of Class 1 trails, which will encourage walking and bicycling in lieu of driving.
4. The project incorporates over 8 miles of Class 2 bike lanes which will encourage bicycling in lieu of driving.
5. The project incorporates over 5 miles of NEV lanes which will encourage use of Neighborhood Electric Vehicles in lieu of driving conventional automobiles.
6. The project provides for bus turnouts which will facilitate transit service.
7. The project includes a minimum of two trees that will be planted within the front yard of each dwelling unit.
8. The project will participate in Placer County Air Pollution Control District’s off-site mitigation program, which allows the District to replace high-emission equipments, such as diesel engines and lawn mowers.

9. Prior to the commencement of grading, the subdivider shall submit a construction emission/dust control plan for approval by the City Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District). The plans shall specify measures to reduce dust pollution during all phases of construction, including the following items:
  - a. Traffic speeds on all unpaved road surfaces shall be posted at 25 m.p.h. or less.
  - b. All grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 m.p.h.
  - c. All adjacent paved streets shall be swept during construction.
  - d. All trucks leaving the site shall be washed off to eliminate dust and debris.
  - e. All exposed surfaces shall be revegetated as quickly as feasible.
  - f. If fill dirt is brought to the construction site, tarps or soil stabilizers shall be placed on the dirt piles to minimize dust problems.
  - g. Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned.
  - h. Low emission mobile construction equipment shall be utilized where possible.
  - i. Open burning is prohibited.
  - j. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission Limitations.
  - k. The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. District personnel, with assistance from the California Air Resources Board, will conduct initial Visible Emission Evaluations of all heavy-duty equipment on the inventory list.
  - l. Construction contracts shall stipulate that at least 20% of the heavy-duty off-road equipment included in the inventory be powered by CARB-certified off-road engines, as follows:
 

m. 175 hp	to	750 hp	1996 and newer engines
n. 100 hp	to	174 hp	1997 and newer engines
o. 50 hp	to	99 hp	1998 and newer engines
  - p. In lieu of or in addition to this requirement, an applicant can use other measures to reduce particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions from their project through the use of emulsified diesel fuel and/or particulate matter traps. The District shall be contacted to discuss this measure.
10. All fireplaces within residential dwelling units shall be restricted to gas or electric only. No wood burning fireplaces.

11. Each single-family home shall be equipped with a whole house fan.
12. Each dwelling unit shall be equipped with energy-reducing programmable thermostat(s).
13. Exterior electrical outlets shall be installed at the front and back of every residence for the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.
14. Landscaping shall be done with native drought resistant species, where appropriate, to reduce water consumption, emissions from lawn equipment, and to provide passive solar benefits.

#### **LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES EMISSIONS REDUCTION STRATEGIES**

Implementation of the project features, City policies and mitigation measures identified above would reduce GHG emissions from construction and operation of the project, as would the energy conservation measures built into the project design. As the preceding discussion suggests, the vast majority of GHG emissions associated with the project are attributable to the combustion of fossil fuels, either in motor vehicles or in electricity-generating power plants. It is the City's observation that there is nothing inherent in a planned development project, even a large project such as Whitney Ranch, that undermines efforts to comply with AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05. Rather, the project's GHG emissions described above reflect the facts (i) that the human beings who will work and shop there will drive motor vehicles using petroleum-derived fuels, and (ii) that the electricity supplied to the buildings is often generated by power plants using fossil fuels such as natural gas, oil, or coal. As the ConSul analysis discussed above points out, the modern single family homes themselves have already reduced their carbon footprint from 1990 standards by 25%.

As the preceding analysis also demonstrates, land use decisions will have limited beneficial or negative effects on climate change as long as vehicles and power plants continue to consume fossil fuels. The State, it is clear, must make significant strides in changing the make-up of transportation fuels and power plant fuels if it is to achieve compliance with AB 32. Should such strides be made, projects such as Whitney Ranch—with residents, shoppers and employees driving in clean cars, and electricity generated by clean power plants – may someday contribute few, if any, GHG emissions.

The discussion identifies and qualitatively analyzes various project features and City policies designed to reduce GHG gases to the extent feasible. The implementation of the above stated project features, mitigation measures and compliance with City policies would reduce the emission of greenhouse gases attributable to the project through vehicle emission reductions, vehicular trip reductions, HFC emission reductions, recycling programs, increases in building and appliance energy efficiencies, and decreased water

use. With the implementation of these project features, air quality mitigation measures from the NWRA EIR, and compliance with City policies, the proposed project would be consistent with the emission reduction strategies contained in the California Climate Action Team's Report to the Governor, the recommended mitigation measures in the CAPCOA January 2008 white paper, and the OPR Technical Memorandum of June 19, 2008. All of these efforts reduce greenhouse gas emissions in compliance with AB32 and Executive Order S-3-05. Therefore, the project's climate change impacts would be considered less than significant.

## **SECTION 5 CONCLUSION**

The Final NWRA EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the development of the Northwest Rocklin Annexation area which included the Whitney Ranch Phase II project area. After the developer proposed various changes to the project, it was determined that preparation of an Addendum to the Final NWRA EIR would be appropriate to confirm the conclusions of the Final NWRA EIR. Based on the analysis provided above, no new significant environmental effects would occur and no substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects would be anticipated. None of the conditions described in §§15162 and 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR are present, and therefore, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, this Addendum to the Final NWRA EIR is the appropriate level of environmental review, as identified in §15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, for the proposed changes to the Whitney Ranch Phase II Project and to address the project's compliance with state law regulating Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

## SECTION 6 REFERENCES

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2006 (July). *Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources* (Technical memorandum Report). Available: <http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/climatechange/reports.cfm>

California Energy Commission. 2006a. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004*. (Staff Final Report). Publication CEC-600-2006-013-SF. Available: [http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/policies/greenhouse\\_gas\\_inventory/index.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/policies/greenhouse_gas_inventory/index.html) and [http://www.energy.ca.gov/global\\_climate\\_change/inventory/documents/index.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/global_climate_change/inventory/documents/index.html).

CA 2005. State of California, Executive Order S-3-05. June 1, 2005. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/energy/ExecOrderS-3-05.htm>

California Air Resources Board. 2007a (August). Draft Updated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Estimates. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ceei/emsinv/emsinv.htm>. Accessed September 2007.

California Climate Action Registry. 2007 (March). General Reporting Protocol, Version 2.2. Los Angeles, CA. Available: <http://www.climateregistry.org/docs/PROTOCOLS/GRP%20V2-March2007.pdf>. Accessed September 2007.

California Energy Commission. 2006b (July). *Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California*. Publication CED-500-2006-077. Available: [http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/biennial\\_reports/2006report/index.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/biennial_reports/2006report/index.html).

CAT 2006. March 2006. State of California, Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Action Team. Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the California Legislature. [http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate\\_action\\_team/reports/index.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/reports/index.html)

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007 (February). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC*. Geneva, Switzerland.



Knowles, N., and D. R. Cayan. 2002. Potential Effects of Global Warming on the Sacramento/San Joaquin Watershed and the San Francisco Estuary. *Geophysics Research Letter* 29(18), 1891, doi:10.1029/2001GL014339.

Medellin et al., *Climate Warming and Water Supply Management in California*. California Climate Change Center, State of California. White Paper CEC-500-2005-195-SF, March.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1992. *Monthly Station Normals of Temperature, Precipitation, and Heating and Cooling Degree Days 1961-1990*. Asheville, NC.

Placer County, *Second Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIR*, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (2007)

