

# 3 CORRECTIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR (ERRATA)

This section contains changes to the text of the Draft EIR that are being made based upon agency and public comments received and responded to in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR. The changes are presented in the order in which they appear in the Draft EIR and are identified by Draft EIR page number. Text deletions are shown in strikeout (~~strikeout~~) and additions are shown in underline (underline).

## SECTION 4.2, “TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION”

**Page 4.2-23–Table 4.2-4, the footnote is revised as follows:**

- <sup>2</sup> Project impact is less than 5% of total intersection V/C or ~~delay~~ total traffic and therefore not a significant impact.

**Page 4.2-37–Table 4.2-10, the footnote is revised as follows:**

- <sup>2</sup> Project impact is less than 5% of total intersection V/C or ~~delay~~ total traffic and therefore not a significant impact.

## SECTION 4.3, “AIR QUALITY”

**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 on page 4.3-19 is revised as follows:**

1. The applicant shall submit to the City Engineer and PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking. This plan must address the minimum requirements of sections 300 and 400 of Rule 228-Fugitive Dust.

Include each of the following notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan:

- ~~1-2.~~ 2. The applicant shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust emissions exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is ARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE) evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis.
- ~~2-3.~~ 3. Fugitive dust emissions shall not exceed 40% opacity and shall not go beyond property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations.
- ~~3-4.~~ 4. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Rule 202-Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits shall be immediately notified to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
- ~~4-5.~~ 5. The project applicant shall ensure compliance with all of PCAPCD’s minimum dust requirements.
- ~~5-6.~~ 6. Water shall be applied to control fugitive dust, as needed, to prevent impacts offsite. Operational water trucks shall be onsite to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.

- ~~6.7.~~ PCAPCD-approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, shall be applied to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours).
- ~~7.8.~~ The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris. Soil binders shall be spread on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas, and streets shall be washed (e.g., wet broom) if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited.
- ~~8.9.~~ During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate disposal site. any kind shall be prohibited.
- ~~9.10.~~ The contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of five minutes for all diesel-fueled equipment.
- ~~10.11.~~ The contractor shall use ARB diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment, and low-sulfur fuel for all stationary equipment.
12. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall submit to PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The inventory shall be updated, beginning 30 days after any initial work on site has begun, and shall be submitted on a monthly basis throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30 day period in which no construction activity occurs. The project representative shall provide PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the project manager and onsite foreman. The project shall provide a plan for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20% NOX reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's website to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure. <http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/index.shtml#construction>.
13. During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- ~~11.14~~ The prime contractor shall suspend all grading and earthmoving operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are high enough to result in dust emissions crossing the property line, despite the application of dust mitigation measures.

## **SECTION 4.5, "POPULATION AND HOUSING"**

### **Page 4.5-1–Paragraph one under the heading "Housing" is revised as follows:**

Rocklin is a community with a low vacancy rate and relatively small households, with housing prices and a residential population that have increased dramatically in the recent past. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the number of housing units in Rocklin increased from 7,481 in 1990 to 14,421 in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). The City's housing growth rate was approximately 93 percent, with the supply and composition of housing changing very little in this 10-year period. In 1990, 68 percent of housing units

were single-family detached structures. This increased to 71 percent in 2000. The State Department of Finance estimated a 2003 housing inventory of 18,048 with a similar distribution of housing types as in 2000 (City of Rocklin, 2004). As of ~~2007~~2009, Rocklin's housing stock consisted of 76% single family and 22% multi-family units (the rest are mobile homes) (Department of Finance 2009). The number of housing units in Rocklin is anticipated to increase with the construction of new and proposed residential projects. Median home prices within the city increased by 31.7 percent in a 1-year period (December 2004 to December 2005), from \$350,000 to \$461,000 (Sacramento Bee 2006). The median home price decreased slightly in 2007 to \$449,000 and to \$292,000 in 2009 (City of Rocklin 2007, 2009).

## **SECTION 4.6, "UTILITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICES"**

### **Page 4.6-5–Paragraphs one and two under the heading "Wastewater Collection and Treatment" are revised as follows:**

Wastewater treatment for the City of Rocklin is provided by the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD), through its membership in the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA). SPMUD and the SPWA operate sewer collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities and provide sewer maintenance and engineering services. In the vicinity of the proposed project, there is an 18-inch sewer main being constructed to serve a nearby project, commonly known as Croftwood, that would be extended to serve the project site (SPMUD 2006). The timing of the Rocklin 60 project vis-à-vis the Croftwood project may require that the Rocklin 60 project instead construct this facility.

SPMUD's 1986 Sewer Master Plan concluded that there would be increasing greenfield development activity, in addition to infill development, in the northwest portion of the City and in the areas east of Interstate 80. The plan envisioned that Rocklin would have a total of 52,604 sewered equivalent dwelling units at ultimate buildout. SPMUD has planned for growth in the City, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on plan projections (City of Rocklin 2005). The SPMUD has since developed the 2009 Sewer Master Plan, which supersedes the 1986 plan. This plan continues to accommodate growth identified for the City of Rocklin. Infrastructure sizing in the updated plan is based on projections from the City's General Plan.

### **Page 4.6-6–The discussion under the heading "Solid Waste" is revised as follows:**

In western Placer County (exclusive of the cities of Roseville and Lincoln), Auburn-Placer Disposal Service provides garbage pickup services. The company also provides pickup service for recyclable materials. The project site is within the service area of Auburn-Placer Disposal Service.

Once collected, solid waste is transported to the ~~Western Regional Landfill~~Placer Waste Management Authority's facility located at the southwest corner of Athens Road and Fiddymont Road, west of the City. The ~~281~~320-acre landfill is operated by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA), a regional agency comprised of Placer County and Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. ~~Waste disposal services at the landfill are provided to these cities, as well as for Auburn, Colfax, and Loomis. An additional 465 acres of land for landfill expansion is located to the west of the current landfill site. The additional acreage is not yet permitted for landfill use by the Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP).~~

A majority of the solid waste received at the WPWMA's facility are first directed to the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) for processing. The MRF is designed to recover recyclable materials from the waste stream such as glass, metals, paper, cardboard, plastics, wood and green waste, electronic wastes and inert materials, such as concrete. The MRF is also capable of accepting and processing source separated recyclables from other recycling programs in the community. The MRF is currently permitted to accept 1,750 tons per day (tpd) but is designed to accommodate approximately 2,200 tpd. The MRF

currently diverts approximately 50% of the material received with the remainder transported to the adjacent Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) for final disposal.

The WRSL is permitted to accept Class II and Class III wastes. At present, the WRSL is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste. The WRSL has a total capacity of approximately 38 million cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of approximately 27 million cubic yards. Based on the current and projected future disposal rates, the WRSL is anticipated to reach capacity in 2042. An additional 465 acres of land for landfill expansion is located to the west of the current landfill site although it is not yet permitted for landfill use.

~~The landfill accepts municipal solid waste from the adjacent Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), as well as sewage sludge and other materials. The landfill is permitted to accept Class II and Class III wastes. At present, the Western Regional Landfill is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste. The landfill has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. At the current remaining capacity, the Western Regional Landfill could continue to be used until 2036. (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2005.)~~

**Page 4.6-6–Paragraph one under the heading “Recycling Facilities” is revised (deleted) as follows:**

### **RECYCLING FACILITIES**

~~The WPWMA developed the 29-acre MRF adjacent to the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill to recover recyclable materials from the waste stream within the County. The MRF has the flexibility to handle all waste, whether mixed waste from the Auburn Placer Disposal Service, or source-separated recyclables from other recycling programs in the community. The MRF recovers recyclable materials such as glass, metals, paper, plastics, wood waste and other compostable materials. Unrecyclable solid waste received at the MRF is then disposed of at the adjacent Western Regional Sanitary Landfill. Currently, the MRF diverts approximately 40% of the material received from the landfill. To continue meeting recycling goals, the MRF has, as of the writing of this document, nearly completed work on a substantial expansion. Notices of completion on this work are expected in November of 2007 (Ford, pers. comm. 2007). This expansion will double its processing capacity and increase the amount of recyclable materials recovered from the waste stream by about 20% (WPWMA 2006).~~

**Page 4.6-16–Paragraph one in the discussion of Impact 4.6-2 is revised as follows:**

SPMUD’s ~~1986-2009~~ Sewer Master Plan envisioned that Rocklin would have 52,604 sewer equivalent dwelling units within the City at ultimate buildout, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on this projection. The City of Rocklin is expected to contain 27,400 housing units, as well as industrial, commercial, and retail development. SPMUD has planned for growth in Rocklin, and the City does not need to take actions to ensure the availability of sewer infrastructure. SPMUD has indicated it will be able to serve the City of Rocklin’s future wastewater treatment needs during the planning period for Rocklin General Plan (City of Rocklin 2005). Using an ~~an rough~~ estimate of 190 gallons per day per ~~acre~~ equivalent dwelling unit (EDU), the project would generate ~~roughly approximately 1134,000~~ 010 gallons per day of wastewater (Placer County 2006). Wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant’s current design capacity is 18 mgd. The plant’s flows average 12 mgd average dry weather flow (ADWF) and 30 mgd average wet weather flows (AWWF). The project’s wastewater generation would represent approximately 0.4~~8~~28% of the treatment plant’s total remaining dry weather estimated capacity. This increased demand would not be expected to adversely affect the wastewater treatment plant’s capacity. Therefore, the additional wastewater volume produced by the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the wastewater treatment services provided by SPMUD.

## SECTION 4.7, “AESTHETICS”

Page 4.7-7–Impact 4.7-4 is revised as follows:

- IMPACT 4.7-4 Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces. The project would require lighting of new development and could construct facilities with reflective surfaces that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on I-80 and Sierra College Boulevard under nighttime conditions. In addition, the degree of darkness in the City of Rocklin, surrounding areas, and on the project site would diminish as a result of development, potentially diminishing views of stars and other features of the night sky. This impact is considered significant.

## SECTION 4.8, “PUBLIC HEALTH AND HAZARDS”

Page 4.8-13–Item “e” is added to Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 as follows:

- e. To ensure that any concentrations of agricultural chemical residue located on the project site are identified and to ensure affected soils will be properly remediated, prior to the initiation of any ground disturbance activities, the Applicant shall provide the Placer County Health and Human Services Department (HHSD) with historic photographs or other evidence of the prior uses at the project site. If the photographs or evidence indicate the project site has been used for agricultural activity in the past, the Applicant shall engage a licensed remediation professional to conduct limited Phase 2 Soil Sampling pertaining to the on-site soils. If pollutants of concern are not detected, further mitigation is not necessary. If the sampling finds concentrations of any agricultural chemical residue that, according to HHSD and/or the Department of Toxic Substances Control, could represent an unacceptable risk to workers on the project site, prior to issuance of a grading permit (acknowledging that some level of earth disturbance is necessary for the Phase 2 Soil Sampling, and for potential remediation efforts), the Applicant shall remediate affected soils to the satisfaction of HHSD and DTSC.

Page 4.8-13–Paragraph one under the Level of Significance discussion for Impact 4.8-1 is revised as follows:

Implementation of this mitigation measure outlines procedures to remove all known potential sources of hazards onsite prior to occupation and establishes procedures to safely remediate any currently unknown potential hazards that could be discovered during the course of project construction. This mitigation measure would remove any known or previously undiscovered contaminated soil or other hazardous materials from the site in accordance with ~~City and County~~ applicable regulatory standards. Because this mitigation would reduce the potential hazards associated with known or unknown contaminated soil or other hazardous materials, impacts related to the creation of a safety hazard to construction workers and the general public would be considered less than significant.

## SECTION 4.10, “HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY”

Page 4.10-15–Item “c” in Mitigation Measure 4.10-3 is revised as follows:

- c. Prior to issuance of grading permit or any construction activity, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB the appropriate regulatory approvals for project construction including a Section 401 water quality certification, ~~and an NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, including construction dewatering activities.~~

**Page 4.10-17–Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 is revised as follows:**

- a. Before issuance of a grading permit for the site, the project applicant shall submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the NPDES General Permit for Construction Related Activities obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB a general NPDES permit and shall comply with all of the permit requirements in order to minimize storm water discharges associated with site operations. In addition, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP and implement Best Management Practices designed to minimize sedimentation and release of products used during site operations.
- b. Before approval of the final project design, the project applicant shall identify storm water runoff BMPs selected from the Storm Water Quality Task Force’s California Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook (American Public Works Association 1993), the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association’s (1999) Start at the Source: Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection, or similar documents. The applicant shall adopt a “treatment train” stormwater quality program in which stormwater is subject to more than one type of BMP. Source control BMPs shall constitute the first-step BMPs and shall include, but would not be limited to, administrative controls, such as signage at inlets to prevent illicit discharges into storm drains and public education. Second-step BMPs may include underground hydrodynamic separators or catch basin filters, or, upon approval of the City of Rocklin, a substitute device of equal or greater effectiveness. The third-step BMP shall include design of the project’s detention basin to serve the dual purpose of a water quality basin, consistent with the Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection published by the Placer Regional Stormwater Coordination Group (PRSCG) (May 2005).
- c. ~~Typical BMPs that could be used on the project site shall include, but are not limited to, catchbasin inserts, compost storm water filters, sand filters, vegetated filter strips, biofiltration swales, oil/water separators, bioretention basins, or other equally effective measures. Other BMPs shall include, but would not be limited to, administrative controls such as signage at inlets to prevent illicit discharges into storm drains, parking lot and other pavement area sweeping, public education, and hazardous waste management and disposal programs. BMPs shall identify and implement mechanisms for the routine maintenance, inspection, and repair of pollution control mechanisms. In addition, †The BMPs shall be reviewed for adequacy by the City of Rocklin, Engineering Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the site to ensure that they will effectively remove pollutants from the site’s stormwater runoff. Long-term functionality of the stormwater quality BMPs shall be provided for through a maintenance and inspection program. Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit, the applicant shall submit to the City of Rocklin Department of Public Works a Maintenance and Monitoring Plan for all stormwater BMPs. The Maintenance and Monitoring Plan shall 1) identify a schedule for the inspection and maintenance of each BMP, 2) identify methods and materials for maintenance of each BMP, 3) and include provisions for the repair or replacement of BMPs.~~

**Page 4.10-17–Paragraph one under the heading “Level of Significance after Mitigation” for Impact 4.10-4 is revised as follows:**

With the implementation of the BMPs identified above, the stormwater discharge from the project site would be captured within the project’s drainage systems and would be filtered through oil/water separators and/or other equally effective control systems prior to being directed to the detention basin. Once in the detention basin, the settlement of undissolved solids would occur, further removing contaminants from the stormwater. As the stormwater is discharged from the detention basin, it would flow through an existing grassy swale for approximately 300 feet before entering Secret Ravine Creek. The grassy swale would remove additional contaminants within the stormwater through biofiltration. The implementation of these BMPs, consistent with the requirements of the site’s NPDES permit and the SWPPP, and design criteria identified by PRSCG, would ensure that the quality of the water entering

Secret Ravine Creek from the project site would not be substantially degraded. Long-term functionality of the BMPs would be provided for through a maintenance and monitoring program. With implementation of the above mitigation measures, the project's operational water quality impacts would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level.

## SECTION 4.12, "BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES"

**Page 4.12-24—The introductory paragraph to Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 is revised as follows:**

The total trunk diameter inches to be removed by the project was calculated during the 2007 tree survey to be 10,651 inches. A final determination of the total trunk diameter inches to be removed by the project will be made at the time that an oak tree removal permit is applied for, and this number of total inches will be used to implement the following measures to mitigate for the loss of protected trees...

**Page 4.12-30—Items "c" and "d" in Mitigation Measure 4.12-11 are revised as follows:**

- c. If black rail is detected, impacts shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the species has evacuated the area. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist and confirmed by DFG; buffer size may vary, depending on the nest location, nest stage, and construction activity. Take of black rail would be avoided in compliance with the Fish and Game Code and CESA.
- d. ~~If black rail is detected, mitigation for loss of federally protected waters of the United States (Mitigation Measure 4.12-1) shall include, at a minimum ratio of 1:1, wetland habitat suitable for use by and within the Sierra Foothill range of the species.~~

## SECTION 4.13, "CULTURAL RESOURCES"

**Page 4.13-12—Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 is revised as follows:**

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

## CHAPTER 6, "CUMULATIVE AND GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS"

**Page 6-14—Table 6-4, the footnote is revised as follows:**

<sup>2</sup> Project impact is less than 5% of total intersection V/C or ~~delay~~ total traffic and therefore not a significant impact.

**Page 6-24–Table 6-8, the footnote is revised as follows:**

<sup>2</sup> Project impact is less than 5% of total intersection V/C or ~~delay~~ total traffic and therefore not a significant impact.



## CHAPTER 8, “REFERENCES”

Page 8-5, Section 4.5, Population and Housing, the following reference is added:

City of Rocklin, 2007 and 2009. City of Rocklin web site. Available at: < <http://www.rocklin.ca.gov/>> Accessed 2007 and July 28, 2009.

