

RESOLUTION NO. PC-2016-

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY
OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps)
(PDG2016-0007)

WHEREAS, the City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator prepared an Initial Study on the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) (PDG2016-0007) (the "Project") which identified potentially significant effects of the Project; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The statements of overriding considerations adopted by the City Council when approving the City of Rocklin General Plan Update are hereby readopted for the purposes of this mitigated negative declaration and the significant identified impacts of this project related to aesthetics, air quality, traffic circulation, noise, cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources, and climate change and greenhouse gases.

Section 5. A mitigated negative declaration of environmental impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared in connection with the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by this reference, are recommended for approval for the Project.

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

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

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners:

NOES: Commissioners:

ABSENT: Commissioners:

ABSTAIN: Commissioners:

Chairperson

ATTEST:

Secretary



**ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF ROCKLIN**

**3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, California 95677
(916) 625-5160**

ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps)

PDG2016-0007

Highway 65 Corridor (Development Areas 104-116) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan in the City of Rocklin. The area is generally bounded by State Route 65 (SR65) on the west, Wildcat Boulevard on the east, the Rocklin/Lincoln City Limits on the north, and Sunset Boulevard on the south.

October 13, 2016

PREPARED BY:

David Mohlenbrok, Environmental Services Manager, (916) 625-5162

CONTACT INFORMATION:

This Initial Study has been prepared by the City of Rocklin, as Lead Agency, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any questions regarding this document should be addressed to David Mohlenbrok at the City of Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department, Planning Division, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, California 95677 (916) 625-5160.

APPLICANT/OWNER:

The applicants and property owners are Orchard Creek Investors LLC/Fulcrum, Evergreen Management Company and William Jessup University.

Initial Study Page 1 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
-----------------------------------	--

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

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

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the Oak Vista Subdivision project. The document relies on a combination of a previous environmental document and site-specific studies to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the proposed project. In particular, this Initial Study assesses the extent to which the impacts of the proposed project have already been addressed in the certified Final Environmental Impact Report for the Rocklin General Plan, as adopted by the Rocklin City Council on October 9, 2012 (the "General Plan EIR"), which incorporated by reference the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Area Final Environmental Impact Report certified and adopted by the Rocklin City Council on July 9, 2002.

B. Document Format

This Initial Study is organized into five sections as follows:

Section 1, Introduction: provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section 2, Summary Information and Determination: Required summary information, listing of environmental factors potentially affected, and lead agency determination.

Initial Study Page 2 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
-----------------------------------	--

Section 3, Project Description: provides a description of the project location, project background, and project components.

Section 4, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts: provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the screening from the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist.

Section 5, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this Initial Study. The reference materials are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and can also be found on the City's website under Planning Department, Current Environmental Documents.

C. CEQA Process

To begin the CEQA process, the lead agency identifies a proposed project. The lead agency then prepares an initial study to identify the preliminary environmental impacts of the proposed project. This document has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to analyze the possible environmental impacts of the project so that the public and the City of Rocklin decision-making bodies (Planning Commission, and/or City Council) can take these impacts into account when considering action on the required entitlements.

During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Environmental Services staff or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Council agenda can be obtained by contacting the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95667 or via the internet at <http://www.rocklin.ca.us>

Within five days of project approval, the City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk. The Notice of Determination will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues that were presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.

SECTION 2. INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY AND DETERMINATION

A. Summary Information

Project Title:

Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps)

Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Rocklin, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677

Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Mohlenbrok, Environmental Services Manager, 916-625-5162

Project Location:

The project site is generally located in the northwest portion of the City of Rocklin, specifically within the Highway 65 Corridor (Development Areas 104-116) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. The area is generally bounded by State Route 65 (SR65) on the west, just west of Wildcat Boulevard on the east, the Rocklin/Lincoln City Limits on the north, and Sunset Boulevard on the south.

Project Sponsor's Name:

The applicants and property owners are Orchard Creek Investors LLC/Fulcrum, Evergreen Management Company and William Jessup University.

Current General Plan Designation: Business Professional (BP), Recreation-Conservation, Retail Commercial RC), Mixed Use (MU), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and Light Industrial (LI).

Proposed General Plan Designation: No changes are proposed.

Current Zoning: Planned Development-Business Professional/Commercial (PD-BP/C), Planned Development Commercial (PD-C), Planned Development-Business Professional (PD-BP), Open Space (OS) and Planned Development-Light Industrial (PD-LI).

Proposed Zoning: No changes are proposed.

Description of the Project:

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) project proposes an amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify traffic caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion (approximately 528 acres) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area while still maintaining City of Rocklin traffic Level of Service standards. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or

Initial Study Page 4 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
-----------------------------------	--

development activity. This project will require a General Development Plan Amendment entitlement. For more detail please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of this Initial Study.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The proposed project site is mostly vacant but does contain some developed areas including the Placer Center for Health off of West Ranch View Drive, a newly developing single-family residential subdivision between Wildcat Boulevard and University Avenue, William Jessup University to the north of Sunset Boulevard and the Atherton Tech Center to the south of Sunset Boulevard. To the north are open space areas and single-family residential development within the City of Lincoln; to the east is Wildcat Boulevard and multi- and single-family residential development within the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area; to the south are open space areas and multi- and single-family residential developments, an office development known as the Rocklin 65 Business Park and a retail commercial development known as the Blue Oaks Town Center, and to the west is State Route 65 and the partly developed Sunset Industrial Area within unincorporated Placer County.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required (e.g., Permits, Financing Approval, or Participation Agreement):

- None (the proposed General Development Plan Amendment will not directly result in any development activities).

B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

Those factors checked below involve impacts that are “Potentially Significant”:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Sig.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None After Mitigation		

C. Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that as originally submitted, the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment; however, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent which will avoid these effects or mitigate these effects to a point where clearly no significant effect will occur. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached Environmental Checklist. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, to analyze the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Marc Mondell
Director of Economic and Community Development

Date

SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The project site is generally located in the northwest portion of the City of Rocklin, specifically within the Highway 65 Corridor (Development Areas 104-116) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. The area is generally bounded by State Route 65 (SR65) on the west, just west of Wildcat Boulevard on the east, the Rocklin/Lincoln City Limits on the north, and Sunset Boulevard on the south. (Please see Attachment A, Vicinity Map).

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

B. Description

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan (GDP) is a specific plan that governs the development of the northwest portion of the City of Rocklin known as the Northwest Rocklin GDP area, within which are two primary sub-areas known as the Highway 65 Corridor and Sunset Ranchos. The Highway 65 Corridor consists of development areas 104 through 116 on the Northwest Rocklin GDP zoning map, totaling approximately 528 acres. When adopted, the NWRA GDP included automobile “trip caps” for each development area within the Highway 65 corridor based on an overall maximum daily trip cap of 77,043 trips, which was the maximum level of traffic that was identified that could be generated by the Highway 65 corridor development areas that would still maintain an acceptable traffic level of service on the City’s roadway system.

Since the time that the original trip caps were adopted in 2002, some changes in land use have occurred introducing single family residential and mixed use land use categories that will accommodate multi-family development allowing for a greater internalization of trips within the area than previously assumed. A clearer picture of the estimated buildout of William Jessup University has also evolved and significant Industrial development is no longer anticipated. An updated travel demand model has also been created and more realistic modeling which factors in aspects such as right turn on red movements has been applied. The updated analysis has determined that there is additional trip capacity beyond the trip caps that were originally identified in the Northwest Rocklin GDP that would still allow the area to maintain an acceptable level of service on the City’s roadway system.

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) project proposes an amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General

Initial Study Page 7 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
-----------------------------------	--

Development Plan area while still maintaining City of Rocklin traffic Level of Service standards. This project will require a General Development Plan Amendment entitlement.

More specifically, the proposed trip cap rate change would go from an existing 77,043 total daily trips to 98,003 total daily trips, an increase of 20,960 total new daily trips. The breakdown of the increased trip allocations by Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area are shown in the table below:

DEVELOPMENT AREA	ACRES	EXISTING TRIP CAP	PROPOSED TRIP CAP (AND DIFFERENCE)
104	66.3	14,636	20,127 (+ 5,501)
106	24.3	6,982	9,275 (+ 2,293)
107	38.4	8,313	14,665 (+6,352)
108	68.0	14,764	16,018 (+1,254)
110	22.7	3,800	1,764 (-2,036)
113	106.1	8,325	15,921 (+7,596)

The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity.

SECTION 4. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Explanation of CEQA Streamlining and Tiering Utilized in this Initial Study

This Initial Study will evaluate this project in light of the previously approved General Plan EIR and the Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Area, Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereafter referred to as the “Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR”), which are hereby incorporated by reference. This document is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and can also be found on the City’s website under Planning Department, Publications and Maps.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provides a means of streamlining analysis for qualifying projects. Under Section 15183, effects are not considered “peculiar to the project or the parcel” if they are addressed and mitigated by uniformly applied development policies and standards adopted by the City to substantially mitigate that effect (unless new information shows that the policy or standard will not mitigate the effect). Policies and standards have been adopted by the City to address and mitigate certain impacts of development that lend themselves to uniform mitigation measures. These policies and standards include those found in the Oak Tree Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 17.77), the Flood Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.16), the Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30), and the Goals and Policies of the Rocklin General Plan. Where applicable, the Initial Study will state how these policies and standards apply to the project.

Initial Study Page 8 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
-----------------------------------	--

Where the policies and standards will substantially mitigate the effects of the proposed project, the Initial Study concludes that these effects are “not peculiar to the project or the parcel” and thus need not be revisited in the text of the environmental document for the proposed project.

This Initial Study has also been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15063 and 15168. Section 15063 sets forth the general rules for preparing Initial Studies. One of the identified functions of an Initial Study is for a lead agency to “[d]etermine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project’s effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration... The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration.” (CEQA Guidelines, section 15063, subd. (b)(1)(C).). Here, the City has used this initial study to determine the extent to which the General Plan EIR or the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR has “adequately examined” the effects of the proposed project.

Section 15168 sets forth the legal requirements for preparing “program EIRs” and for reliance upon program EIRs in connection with “[s]ubsequent activities” within the approved program. (See *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 598, 614-617.) The General Plan and Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIRs were program EIRs with respect to their analysis of impacts associated with eventual buildout of future anticipated development identified by the General Plan and the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, respectively. Subdivision (c) of section 15168 provides as follows:

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
 - (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.
 - (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.
 - (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions on the project.
 - (4) Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.

Initial Study Page 9 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
-----------------------------------	---

Consistent with these principles, this Initial Study serves the function of a “written checklist or similar device” documenting the extent to which the environmental effects of the proposed project “were covered in the program EIR” for the General Plan and/or the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. As stated below, the City has concluded that the impacts of the proposed project are “within the scope” of the analysis in the General Plan EIR and/or the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR. Stated another way, these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR.” Where particular impacts were not thoroughly analyzed in prior documents, site-specific studies were prepared for the project with respect to impacts that were not “adequately examined” in the General Plan EIR, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR, or were not “within the scope” of the prior analysis. These studies are hereby incorporated by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677 and can also be found on the City’s website under Planning Department, Current Environmental Documents. The specific studies are listed in Section 5, References.

The Initial Study is a public document to be used by the City decision-makers to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the City as lead agency, finds substantial evidence that any effects of the project were not “adequately examined” in the General Plan EIR or were not “within the scope” of the analysis in that document AND that these effects may have a significant effect on the environment if not mitigated, the City would be required to prepare an EIR with respect to such potentially significant effects. On the other hand, if the City finds that these unaddressed project impacts are not significant, a negative declaration would be appropriate. If in the course of analysis, the City identified potentially significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation measures to which the applicant agrees, the impact would be considered to be reduced to a less than significant level, and adoption of a mitigated negative declaration would be appropriate.

B. Significant Cumulative Impacts; Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Rocklin City Council has previously identified the following cumulative significant impacts as unavoidable consequences of urbanization contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan (which includes development of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area), despite the implementation of all available and feasible mitigation measures, and on that basis has adopted a statement of overriding considerations for each cumulative impact:

Initial Study Page 10 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

1. Air Quality:

Development in the City and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin as a whole will result in the following: violations of air quality standards as a result of short-term emissions from construction projects, increases in criteria air pollutants from operational air pollutants and exposure to toxic air contaminants, the generation of odors and a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts.

2. Aesthetics/Light and Glare:

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in substantial degradation of the existing visual character, the creation of new sources of substantial light and glare and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, existing visual character and creation of light and glare.

3. Traffic and Circulation:

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in impacts to segments and intersections of the state/interstate highway system.

4. Noise

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in impacts associated with exposure to surface transportation and stationary noise sources, and cumulative transportation noise impacts within the Planning area.

5. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in cumulative impacts to historic character.

6. Biological Resources

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in the loss of native oak and heritage trees, the loss of oak woodland habitat, and cumulative impacts to biological resources.

7. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.

Initial Study Page 11 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

C. Mitigation Measures Required and Considered

It is the policy and a requirement of the City of Rocklin that all public agencies with authority to mitigate significant effects shall undertake or require the undertaking of all feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior environmental impact reports relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment. Project review is limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project which were not addressed as significant effects in the General Plan EIR and/or Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the General Plan EIR and/or Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR. This Initial Study anticipates that feasible mitigation measures previously identified in the General Plan and the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan has been, or will be, implemented as set forth in that document, and evaluates this Project accordingly.

D. Evaluation of Environmental Checklist:

- 1) A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site elements, cumulative as well as project-level impacts, indirect as well as direct impacts, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) If a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.
- 4) Answers of “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” describe the mitigation measures agreed to by the applicant and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures and supporting explanation from earlier EIRs or Negative Declaration may be cross-referenced and incorporated by reference.
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, and the City intends to use tiering. All prior EIRs and Negative Declarations and certifying resolutions are available for review at the Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department. In this case, a brief discussion will identify the following:

Initial Study Page 12 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

- a) Which effects are within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether such effects are addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis; and
- b) For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

E. Environmental Checklist

I. AESTHETICS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	
b) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X	
c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.				X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no change the existing visual nature or character of the project site and area nor will there be any new sources of light and glare. As discussed below, aesthetic impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the visual character of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. When previously undeveloped land becomes developed, aesthetic impacts include changes to scenic character and new sources of light and glare (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages

Initial Study Page 14 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

4.3-1 through 4.3-18). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Elements, and include policies that encourage the use of design standards for unique areas and the protection of natural resources, including open space areas, natural resource areas, hilltops, waterways and oak trees, from the encroachment of incompatible land use.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for aesthetic/visual impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Scenic Vista - No Impact. The Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area is not located in an area that includes a designated scenic vista and the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity that would potentially introduce incompatible scenic elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially block views of a scenic vista. Therefore, there are no scenic vista impacts.

b. Visual Quality – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. Therefore, there is no visual quality impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will be required to comply with development standards including the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Design Guidelines and applicable zoning. In addition, other than single-family subdivisions on lots greater than 6,000 square feet, future development will require design review entitlements which will allow the City to examine and regulate the aesthetic aspects of proposed projects.

Initial Study Page 15 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Together, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan and Design Guidelines help to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community such that new visual elements would not be incompatible with the character of the area.

c. Scenic Highway – No Impact. The proposed project is not located adjacent to or within the proximity of a state listed scenic highway (State Route 65 is not a state listed scenic highway). Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage or remove scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and there would be no scenic highway impact.

d. Light and Glare – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. Therefore, there are no specific features within the proposed project that would introduce new sources or create unusual light and glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and there would be no light and glare impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will be required to comply with Design Guidelines and the General Plan policies addressing light and glare to ensure that no unusual daytime glare or nighttime lighting is produced. However, the impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the Planning Area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated.

II.**AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?				X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, impacts to agricultural resources are not anticipated.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b., c., d. and e. Farmland, Williamson Act, Forest Land/Timberland, Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land- *No Impact*. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) land classifications system monitors and documents land use changes that specifically affect California's agricultural land and is administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC). The FMMP land classification system is cited by the State CEQA Guidelines as the preferred information source for determining the agricultural significance of a property (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). The CDC, Division of Land Resource Protection, Placer County Important Farmland Map of 2014 designates the project site as urban and built-up land. These categories are not considered Important Farmland under the definition in CEQA of "Agricultural Land" that is afforded consideration as to its potential significance (See CEQA Section 21060.1[a]), nor are they considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance; therefore the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Also, the Highway 65 Corridor project site contains no parcels that are under a Williamson Act contract or that are considered forestry lands or timberland. Therefore, because the project would not convert important farmland to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing agricultural or forestry use zoning or Williamson Act contracts, or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses or the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, there would be no agricultural or forestry use impacts.

Initial Study Page 18 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan?		X			
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X			
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)?		X			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, the proposed project is anticipated to cause increases in traffic and resultant air quality emissions because the existing automobile trip caps for development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area will be increased, but such air quality emission impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to regional air quality as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included 8-hour ozone attainment, short-term construction emissions, operational air pollutants, increases in criteria pollutants, odors and regional air quality impacts. (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.2-1 through 4.2-43). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use, the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation, and the Circulation Elements, and include policies that encourage a mixture of land uses, provisions for non-automotive modes of transportation, consultation with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), and the incorporation of stationary and mobile source control measures.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals and policies, significant air quality impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan and other development within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin as a whole will result in the following: violations of air quality standards as a result of short-term emissions from construction projects, increases in criteria air pollutants from operational air pollutants and exposure to toxic air contaminants, the generation of odors and a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for air quality impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Initial Study Page 20 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Raney Planning and Management, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis report for the proposed project. The report, dated October 2016, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Raney Planning and Management has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Raney Planning and Management report, which is summarized below.

Construction Emissions

The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there are no resulting construction emissions.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to air quality as a result of construction emissions will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to air quality as a result of construction emissions as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will be required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including, but not limited to, the following, which would be noted with City-approved construction plans:

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

Mobile Source Emissions

To determine the change in air pollutant emissions that would result from approval of the proposed project, mobile emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) – a statewide model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify air quality emissions, including GHG emissions. PCAPCD recommends using the most up-to-date version of CalEEMod and as such version 2016.3.1 of the software was used. The model applies inherent default values for various land uses, including vehicle mix, trip length, average speed, etc. However,

Initial Study Page 21 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

where project-specific data was available, such data was input into the model (e.g., information from the *Transportation Impact Analysis* conducted by Fehr and Peers). Two distinct scenarios were modelled for emissions analysis.

Baseline Modeling Scenario

The first scenario represented operation of the project area under baseline build-out assumptions for the current area daily trip cap. In addition to the application of Fehr and Peers provided average daily trip rates, the baseline build-out modeling scenario assumed build-out of the project area would result in the construction of:

- 1,373,000 square feet (sf) of General Office buildings;
- 1,038,000 sf of Retail buildings;
- 810,000 sf of General Light Industrial buildings; and
- Capacity for 1,200 University students.

Because the baseline scenario represents build-out of the area under currently approved land use designations, the baseline scenario represents a reference point for mobile emission generation in the area. Once established, baseline emissions related to the currently approved daily trip cap may subsequently be compared to estimated emissions that would result due to proposed changes to the daily trip cap. Therefore, a second scenario was modelled using the proposed changes to the daily trip cap.

Proposed Project Modeling Scenario

The proposed project scenario assumed that build-out of the project area could result in the construction of:

- 1,390,000 sf of General Office buildings;
- 1,482,000 sf Retail buildings;
- 91,000 sf of General Light Industrial buildings;
- 370 Single Family dwelling units;
- 417 Multi-Family dwelling units; and
- Capacity for 3,300 University students.

In addition to the above land use changes, information from the *Transportation Impact Analysis* was also included in the proposed project modeling scenario. Such information included the estimated daily trip rates used for each type of land use, as well as the increase in the daily trip cap of 20,967 daily trips per day throughout the project area. Fehr and Peers also provided an estimated average trip length for trips within the City of six miles per trip. Therefore, an increase of 20,967 daily trips, where each trip would have an average distance of six-miles, would result in an estimated increase of 125,802 vehicle miles travelled (VMT) per day (i.e.

Initial Study Page 22 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

20,967 daily trips x six miles per trip). Estimated VMT is important for air quality analysis because the increase in VMT represents the actual increase in the amount of distance travelled in motor vehicles and thus the amount of additional air pollutants emitted. As such, trip lengths in CalEEMod were adjusted to achieve a VMT comparable to the VMT estimated by Fehr and Peers.

By modeling future emissions based on the currently approved daily trip cap for the area as well as modeling potential emissions that would result from the increase in VMT due to the proposed project, the estimated increase in emissions associated with the proposed project can be determined and compared to PCAPCD's operational and cumulative operational emissions thresholds presented in the PCAPCD Thresholds of Significance table below.

PCAPCD THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE		
Pollutant	Operational Threshold (lbs/day)	Cumulative Operational Threshold (lbs/day)
ROG	55	55
NO _x	55	55
PM ₁₀	82	82
Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District. CEQA Thresholds. Accessible at http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/air/landuseceqa/ceqathresholds . Accessed September 2016.		

Mobile Emissions Comparisons

The estimated operational emissions from mobile sources for the baseline and proposed project scenarios are presented and compared below in the Unmitigated Operational Mobile Emissions table below.

UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL MOBILE EMISSIONS (LBS/DAY)				
	Baseline Emissions	Proposed Project Emissions	Difference	Threshold
ROG	163.52	211.07	+47.55	55
NO _x	265.73	342.33	+76.6	55
PM ₁₀	311.23	396.04	+84.81	82
Source: CalEEMod, October 2016 (See Appendix)				

As shown, the proposed project would result in an increase in mobile source emissions as compared to the baseline scenario. As discussed earlier, the increase in mobile source emissions would be due to the proposed increase in allowable daily trips in the area. To determine the significance of the estimated increase in mobile source emissions, the difference between baseline emissions and estimated emissions from the proposed project can be compared to PCAPCD's recently proposed thresholds of significance. Emissions of ROG would be anticipated to increase by 47.55 lbs/day with approval of the proposed project. However,

Initial Study Page 23 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

such an increase would be below the 55 lbs/day threshold for ROG, and thus emissions of ROG from the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone on an operational level.

However, the proposed project would result in an increase of NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from baseline conditions in excess of PCAPCD's recently proposed thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a substantial contribution to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone and PM₁₀ on an operational level.

Cumulative Air Quality

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

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

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS, and thus result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM₁₀ are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's cumulative-level thresholds, the project could be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans, and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As shown in the Unmitigated Operational Mobile Emissions table above, the proposed project would result in an increase of ROG emissions that would be below the applicable cumulative-level threshold. However, the proposed project would result in increases of NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that would exceed the applicable cumulative-level threshold.

The General Plan EIR identified a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact.

Initial Study Page 24 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Significance Conclusions:

a., b. and c. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) – *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.* The proposed project area is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The SVAB is designated nonattainment for the federal particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) and the State particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) standards, as well as for both the federal and State ozone standards. The federal Clean Air Act requires areas designated as federal nonattainment to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures for states to use to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. In compliance with regulations, the PCAPCD periodically prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions via regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Ozone Attainment Plan), adopted September 26, 2013. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) determined the Plan to be adequate and made such findings effective August 25, 2014. On January 9, 2015, the USEPA approved the 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan.

The 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the CAA requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the USEPA also strengthened the secondary 8-hour ozone NAAQS, making the secondary standard identical to the primary standard. The SVAB remains classified as a severe nonattainment area with an attainment deadline of 2027. On October 26, 2015 the USEPA released a final implementation rule for the revised NAAQS for ozone to address the requirements for reasonable further progress, modeling and attainment demonstrations, and reasonably available control measures (RACM) and reasonably available control technology (RACT). With the publication of the new NAAQS ozone rules, areas in nonattainment must update their ozone attainment plans and submit new plans by 2020/2021.

General conformity requirements of the regional air quality plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity

Initial Study Page 25 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. In order to evaluate ozone and other criteria air pollutant emissions and support attainment goals for those pollutants that the area is designated nonattainment, the PCAPCD has recently proposed updates to the District's recommended significance thresholds for emissions of PM₁₀, and ozone precursors – reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x).

The significance thresholds, expressed in pounds per day (lbs/day), listed in the table above are the PCAPCD's updated recommended thresholds of significance for use in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with proposed development projects. The City of Rocklin, as lead agency, is considering a phased in approach of the newly proposed thresholds but for this analysis is utilizing the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for CEQA evaluation purposes. Thus, if a project's emissions exceed the PCAPCD's pollutant thresholds presented above, the project could have a significant effect on air quality, the attainment of federal and State AAQS, and could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Through the combustion of fossil fuels, motor vehicle use produces significant amounts of pollution. In fact, the PCAPCD cites motor vehicles as a primary source of pollution for residential, commercial, and industrial development. Because motor vehicles emit air quality pollutants during their operations, changing the amount of motor vehicle operations in an area would change the amount of air pollutants being emitted in that area.

Implementation of the proposed project would involve changes to the allowable amount of vehicle trips to and from the project area. Originally, the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan included a maximum daily trip cap of 77,043 trips; the *Transportation Impact Analysis*, prepared by Fehr and Peers for the proposed project, determined that land use changes would result in a daily trip increase of 20,967 for a total of 98,010 daily trips. Because mobile source pollutant emissions are directly proportional to vehicle usage, the proposed project would increase the amount of mobile source air pollution generated in the project area, as compared to what was originally anticipated for the Northwest Rocklin Area.

While emissions or ROG would not be considered to contribute to the region's nonattainment status for ozone on an operational or cumulative level, the proposed project could contribute emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ in excess of PCAPCD's operational and cumulative-level thresholds. Thus the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact related to the emission of criteria pollutants for which PCAPCD is in non-attainment

To address the exceedance of the emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ and reduce them below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project:

III.-1 In conjunction with submittal of a development application for any projects within the Northwest Rocklin Area that exceed the 2002 trip cap (as calculated using the trip generation rates provided in the May 2016 Final Transportation Impact Analysis for the Northwest Rocklin Area General Development Plan), the applicant shall prepare and submit an Air Quality Emissions Estimate identifying the project's increase in estimated NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from mobile sources as compared to those allowed under the 2002 trip cap. The estimated increase in mobile source emissions shall remain at or below 20.7 percent for NO_x and 17.7 percent for PM₁₀. If the emissions estimate identifies an increase beyond those identified above, the applicant shall submit an Air Quality Reduction Plan sufficient to reduce NO_x and/or PM₁₀ emissions to within the allowable emissions increases. The measures included in the Air Quality Reduction Plan would be anticipated to focus on the reduction of mobile source emissions by including project elements that encourage alternative modes of transportation, promote non-motorized transportation and result in the reduction of number of vehicle trips as well as vehicle trip lengths. The Air Quality Reduction Plan may also include payment of mitigation fees into the PCAPCD's Off-site Air Quality Mitigation Fund as a method of reducing NO_x emissions. PCAPCD's Off-site Air Quality Mitigation supports fleet Fee program supports fleet modernizations, repowers, retrofits, and fleet expansions of heavy duty on- and off-road mobile vehicles/equipment; alternative fuels infrastructure or low emission fuel purchases; new or expanded alternative transit service programs; light-duty low emission vehicle (LEV) programs; public education; repower of agricultural pump engines, and other beneficial air quality projects. Mitigation fees collected from land use developments by the PCAPCD are distributed through the District's annual Clean Air Grant (CAG) Program, which would help to reduce regional NO_x emissions.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure will reduce impacts of the exceedance of the emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ and reduce them below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds to a less than significant level,

The PCAPCD's Offsite Air Quality Mitigation Fund supports fleet modernizations, repowers, retrofits, and fleet expansions of heavy duty on- and off-road mobile vehicles/equipment; alternative fuels infrastructure or low emission fuel purchases; new or expanded alternative transit service programs; light-duty low emission vehicle (LEV) programs; public education; repower of agricultural pump engines, and other beneficial air quality projects. Mitigation fees collected from land use developments by the PCAPCD are distributed through the District's annual Clean Air Grant (CAG) Program, which funds emission reduction projects and the aforementioned programs. According to the PCAPCD, the cost to reduce one ton of emissions through participation in the PCAPCD's Offsite Mitigation Fee Program is \$17,080.00/ton.

d. Sensitive Receptors – Less Than Significant Impact. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others, due to the types of population groups or activities

Initial Study Page 27 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

involved. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and/or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, childcare centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. The proposed project involves a change to the allowable daily trip cap for the Northwest Rocklin Area, but does not involve direct development or siting of new sensitive receptors. Nevertheless, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could include major pollutant concentrations of concern, CO emissions and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions, which are addressed in further detail below.

Localized CO Emissions

Localized concentrations of CO are related to the levels of traffic and congestion along streets and at intersections. The proposed project involves changes to the maximum daily trip cap for the project area. The City of Rocklin *General Plan Circulation Element* concluded that under currently approved land use designations and trip caps for the Northwest Rocklin Area, the project area's roadway system would operate above the General Plan required Level of Service (LOS) of C. Subsequent analysis conducted by Fehr and Peers and included in the *Transportation Impact Analysis* determined that the circulation system in the Northwest Rocklin Area included excess capacity that would not be used under the original daily traffic cap. Furthermore, the *Transportation Impact Analysis* concluded that the circulation system of the area would maintain acceptable LOS at all intersections with the addition of 20,967 daily trips to the project area.

In accordance with the State CO Protocol, the PCAPCD recommends further analysis for localized CO concentrations if the project would cause a signalized intersection to be degraded from an acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F), or substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak-hour LOS at an intersection, as determined by a traffic study. As discussed, the project area's circulation system currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in the daily traffic cap for the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the degradation of LOS at any intersections from acceptable to unacceptable levels, and the proposed project would not result in the emission of substantial localized CO concentrations.

TAC Emissions

Another category of environmental concern is TACs. The CARB's *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (Handbook) provides recommended setback distances for sensitive land uses from major sources of TACs, including, but not limited to, freeways and high traffic roads, distribution centers, and rail yards. The CARB has identified diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC; thus, high volume

Initial Study Page 28 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

freeways, stationary diesel engines, and facilities attracting heavy and constant diesel vehicle traffic are identified as having the highest associated health risks from DPM.

In recognition of potential health effects that TAC emissions could have on future sensitive receptors in the project area, the City of Rocklin *General Plan Air Quality Element* includes Policy OCR-58 and OCR-59, which require development projects to incorporate stationary and mobile source control measures during construction and operation as well as requiring consultation with the PCAPCD to develop stationary and mobile source control measures. The City of Rocklin *General Plan EIR* concluded that the aforementioned General Plan policies would reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Additionally, the *General Plan EIR* included Mitigation Measure 4.2.1, which would reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential health risks from TACs by maintaining adequate distance between existing and potential sources of TACS and existing or proposed sensitive receptors.

The proposed project involves the increase of the daily traffic cap for the Northwest Rocklin Area. As such, the proposed project would not directly involve development activities that could expose sensitive receptors to TACs. Additionally, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be subject to the aforementioned City of Rocklin General Plan Policies and General Plan EIR mitigation measures.

Because the proposed project does not directly involve the siting of new sensitive receptors, nor the development of new stationary sources of TACs, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of pollutants. Moreover, development of the project area would be subject to all relevant General Plan policies and General Plan EIR mitigation measures. Therefore, impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

e. Odors – Less Than Significant Impact. Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. Specific development projects are not included in the proposed project; rather, the proposed project involves increases in the daily traffic cap for the proposed project area.

Because the proposed project does not involve direct development activity, the proposed project would not result in the creation of odors from land development. Although less common, emissions of DPM from heavy-duty diesel truck traffic could result in objectionable odors. However, such odors would be created under currently approved build-out conditions. While the proposed project would increase the total amount of vehicle trips, the increase in

Initial Study Page 29 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

area vehicle activity would not necessarily create an increase in heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, because much of the traffic increase would be a result of increased residential land uses. Residential land uses are not typically associated with heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, and thus the increase in daily trips attributable to residential land uses would mainly involve single passenger vehicles that are not typically considered to be sources of objectionable odors.

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

Because the proposed project does not directly involve land development, and the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of single passenger vehicles rather than heavy-duty diesel trucks, the proposed project would not be anticipated to create objectionable odors in the project area, from what was previously anticipated in the City of Rocklin General Plan and General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?				X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no modifications of existing habitats. As discussed below, biological resources impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the biological resources of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included special-status species, species of concern, non-listed species, biological communities and migratory wildlife corridors (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.10-1 through 4.10-47). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, and include policies that encourage the protection and conservation of biological resources and require compliance with rules and regulations protecting biological resources, including the City of Rocklin Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals, policies and rules and regulations protecting biological resources, significant biological resources impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will impact sensitive biological communities, will result in the loss of native oak and heritage trees, will result in the loss of oak woodland habitat and will contribute to cumulative impacts to biological resources. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for biological resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Initial Study Page 32 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Significance Conclusions:

a. Effect on Protected Species – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity nor does it result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan; therefore there is no protected species impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to protected species will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to biological resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

b. and c. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or activity nor does it result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan; therefore there is no riparian habitat and wetlands impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to biological resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

d. Riparian Corridors – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or activity nor does it result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan; therefore there is no riparian corridors impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to riparian corridors will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to biological resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

e. Local Policies/Ordinances – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity nor does it result in any change to the

Initial Study Page 33 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan; therefore there is no conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to biological resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

f. Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan – No Impact The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity nor does it result any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan because the Highway 65 Corridor project area is not subject to any such plan.; therefore there is no conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan impacts.

V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no ground disturbance that could affect unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources or sites. As discussed below, cultural resources impacts would not be anticipated or would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Initial Study Page 35 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Historic Resources – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no historic resources impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to historic resources will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to cultural resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

b. and c. Archaeological Resources and Paleontological Resources – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no archaeological and paleontological resources impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources will be analyzed. Because

Initial Study Page 36 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to cultural resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

d. Human Remains – *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no human remains impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to human remains will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts to cultural resources as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the state Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X	
iv) Landslides?				X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table I8-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Branches of the Foothill Fault system, which are not included on the Alquist-Priolo maps, pass through or near the City of Rocklin and could pose a seismic hazard to the area including ground shaking, seismic ground failure, and landslides. The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no ground disturbance that could lead to erosion or construction of structures that would be subject to geologic conditions. As discussed below, geology and soils impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for geology and soils impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this

Initial Study Page 39 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City ordinances, rules and regulations.

In addition, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be subject to the provisions of the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on or across the permit area; to comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites.

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., i. and ii. Fault Rupture, Ground Shaking – No Impact. Branches of the Foothill Fault system, which are not included on the Alquist-Priolo maps, pass through or near the City of Rocklin and could pose a seismic hazard to the area including ground shaking, seismic ground failure, and landslides. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no fault rupture or ground shaking impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential geology and soils impacts will be analyzed.

a., iii. and iv. Liquefaction, Landslides – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity and there is no risk of landslide as the terrain in the Highway 65 Corridor area is relatively flat; therefore there is no liquefaction and landslide impact.

Initial Study Page 40 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential geology and soils impacts will be analyzed. It is anticipated that the application of development standards contained in the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding geologic hazards, and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to geologic conditions would reduce the potential impact from liquefaction to less than significant.

b., c. & d. Soil Erosion, Unstable Soil, Expansive Soil – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. Absent any earth-moving activities or construction of any structures, no erosion would occur and no buildings would be affected by unstable or expansive soils; therefore there is no soil erosion, unstable soils or expansive soils impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential geology and soils impacts will be analyzed.

e. Inadequate Soils for Disposal - No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore the project would not require septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems and there is no inadequate soil for disposal impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario will require review under CEQA at which time potential geology and soils impacts will be analyzed.

VII. <u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X			
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X			

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

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

While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in the generation of area- and mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases from construction and operation activities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Initial Study Page 42 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for greenhouse gas emissions impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Raney Planning and Management, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis report for the proposed project. This analysis was prepared to estimate the project's greenhouse gas emissions from potential increased motor vehicle trips. Their report, dated October 2016, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Raney Planning and Management has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Raney Planning and Management report, which is summarized below.

Greenhouse Gas Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, similar to a greenhouse. The accumulation of GHG emissions has been implicated as a driving force for Global Climate change. Definitions of climate change vary between and across

Initial Study Page 43 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

regulatory authorities and the scientific community, but in general can be described as the changing of the earth's climate caused by natural fluctuations and the impact of human activities that alter the composition of the global atmosphere.

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emission of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, city and virtually every individual on Earth. A project's GHG emissions are at a micro-scale relative to global emissions, but could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact

The major concern is that increases in GHG emissions are causing Global Climate Change. Global Climate Change is a change in the average weather on earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the speed of global warming and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, the vast majority of the scientific community now agrees that there is a direct link between increased GHG emissions and long term global temperature increases. Potential global warming impacts in California may include, but are not limited to, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, more drought years, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity. In California, GHGs are defined to include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃), and hydrofluorocarbons. To account for the warming potential of GHGs, GHG emissions are quantified and reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e).

An individual project, even a very large project, does not in itself generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to measurably influence global climate change. Global climate change is therefore by definition a cumulative impact. A project contributes to this potential cumulative impact through its cumulative incremental contribution combined with the emissions of all other sources of greenhouse gases (GHG). In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable" (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064 (h)(1) and 15130). To make this determination, the incremental impacts of the project must be compared to with the effects of past, current and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and probable future projects to make this determination is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

Regulatory Framework

In September 2006, then Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 delegated the authority for its implementation to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and directs CARB to enforce the statewide cap. In accordance with AB

Initial Study Page 44 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

32, CARB prepared the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) for California, which was approved in 2008. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions. Based on the reduction goals called for in the 2008 Scoping Plan, a 29 percent reduction in GHG levels relative to a Business As Usual (BAU) scenario would be required to meet 1990 levels by 2020. The BAU condition is project and site specific and varies. The BAU scenario is based on what could or would occur on a particular site in the year 2020 without implementation of a proposed project or consideration of any State regulation emission reductions or voluntary GHG reduction measures. The CARB, per the 2008 Scoping Plan, explicitly recommends that local governments utilize a 15 percent GHG reduction below “today’s” levels by 2020 to ensure that community emissions match the State’s reduction target, where today’s levels would be considered 2010 BAU levels.

In 2011, the baseline or BAU level for the Scoping Plan was revised to account for the economic downturn and State regulation emission reductions (i.e., Pavley, Low Carbon Fuel Standard [LCFS], and Renewable Portfolio Standard [RPS]). Accordingly, the Scoping Plan emission reduction target from BAU levels required to meet 1990 levels by 2020 was modified from 29 percent to 21.7 percent where the BAU level is based on 2010 levels singularly, or 16 percent where the BAU level is based on 2010 levels and includes State regulation emission reductions noted above. The amended Scoping Plan was re-approved August 24, 2011.

The Scoping Plan must be updated every five years. The *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan Update) was approved by CARB on May 22, 2014 and builds upon the initial Scoping Plan with new strategies and recommendations. The Scoping Plan Update highlights the State’s progress towards the 2020 GHG emission reduction goals defined in the original Scoping Plan and evaluates how to align the State’s longer-term GHG reduction strategies with other State policy priorities for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation and land use. According to the Scoping Plan Update, the State is on track to meet the 2020 GHG goal and has created a framework for ongoing climate action that could be built upon to maintain and continue economic sector-specific reductions beyond 2020, on the path to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, as required by AB 32.

SIGNIFICANCE CONCLUSIONS:

a. and b.) Generate Greenhouse Gas and Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Plan – *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.* Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. Because the proposed project involves increased vehicle use in the area, the GHG emissions related to increased vehicle use in the area must be analyzed. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MT CO₂e/yr).

Initial Study Page 45 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Previously, the City of Rocklin relied on methodology included in the California Air Resources Board's original *Climate Change Scoping Plan* for the analysis of potential impacts related to GHG emissions. The original Scoping Plan recommended an analysis methodology based on project-specific reductions in GHG emissions compared to a Business-As-Usual (BAU) scenario. The BAU scenarios were based off of GHG emissions projections for anticipated growth without the inclusion of measures that would reduce GHG emissions, such as improvements in vehicle fuel efficiency, energy efficiency, and the increased use of renewable energy sources for energy supply. However, on November 30, 2015, the California Supreme Court issued a decision in the *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife* (Newhall Ranch) case, in which the court ruled that analysis based on BAU scenarios was insufficient to support conclusions that proposed projects would have less-than-significant impacts. In response to the Newhall Ranch Ruling, the City of Rocklin is relying on the proposed new guidance from the PCAPCD to determine the significance of proposed projects in regards to GHG emissions.

The proposed thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold is judged by the PCAPCD as having a less than significant impact on GHG emissions within the District and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Projects that would result in emissions above the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold would not necessarily result in substantial impacts, if certain efficiency thresholds are met. The efficiency thresholds, which are based on service populations and square footage, are presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table below.

PCAPCD GHG OPERATIONAL THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
Efficiency Thresholds			
Residential (MT CO ₂ e/capita)		Non-Residential (MT CO ₂ e/1,000 sf)	
Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District. CEQA Thresholds. Accessible at http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/air/landuseceqa/ceqathresholds . Accessed October 2016.			

Projects that fall below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or meet the efficiency thresholds are considered to be in keeping with statewide GHG emissions reduction targets, which would ensure that the proposed project would not inhibit the State's achievement of GHG emissions reductions. Thus, projects which involve emissions below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or below the efficiency thresholds presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table above are considered to result in less-than-significant impacts in regards GHG emissions within the District and would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Finally, the PCAPCD has also established a Bright Line Cap, which shall be the maximum limit for any proposed project. The Bright Line Cap is 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr for all types of projects.

Initial Study Page 46 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

The proposed increase to the daily traffic cap for the area would result in increased amounts of vehicle use in the area, which would contribute to increases of GHG emissions that are associated with global climate change. The proposed project's mobile emissions were modeled using the same assumptions and methodology presented in the Air Quality Section of this report. A comparison of GHG emissions from the baseline modeling scenario and the proposed project scenario is presented below in the Unmitigated Operational Mobile GHG Emissions table below.

UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL MOBILE GHG EMISSIONS (MT CO₂e/yr)		
Baseline Emissions	Proposed Project Emissions	Difference
37,259	49,587	+12,328
<i>Source: CalEEMod, October 2016 (See Appendix)</i>		

The proposed project would include approximately 2,963,000 sf of non-residential structures. Therefore, given the proposed project's estimated mobile emissions, of 49,587 MT CO₂e/yr, the proposed project would result in an efficiency rate of 16.74 MT CO₂e/1,000 sf, which would be well below PCAPCD's urban non-residential efficiency threshold of 26.5 MT CO₂e/1,000 sf.

However, the difference of emissions between the baseline emissions, the emissions that would occur under the current trip cap for the project area, and the proposed project's emissions, the emissions that would result from increased vehicle use in the project area, would be 12,328 MT CO₂e/yr. The difference in emissions would therefore be above PCAPCD's Bright Line Cap of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr. As a result, the proposed project would be considered to result in a potentially significant impact related to GHG emissions and global climate change.

To address the exceedance of the GHG emissions above the PCAPCD's Bright Line Cap of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr and reduce it below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project:

VII.-1 Implement Mitigation Measure III.-1.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure will reduce impacts of the exceedance of the GHG emissions above the PCAPCD's Bright Line Cap of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr and reduce it below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds to a less than significant level.

This Initial Study evaluates a "subsequent activity" that was already evaluated by the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR identified the generation of greenhouse gas emissions as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact. The project does not result in a change to this finding because future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario will generate greenhouse gas emissions. While the proposed project would

Initial Study Page 47 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

cumulatively contribute to the significant and unavoidable impact of generation of greenhouse gas emissions as recognized in the General Plan EIR, the proposed project itself will not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to measurably influence global climate change.

VIII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.				X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	
f) 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?				X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	
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?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no new structures or occupants that would be exposed to hazards or hazardous materials. As discussed below, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for human health and hazards impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan and the City's Improvement Standards, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

Initial Study Page 50 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

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

Significance Conclusions:

a. Hazardous Materials – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no hazardous materials impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to hazardous materials but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to hazardous materials will be analyzed.

b. Hazardous Emissions – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no hazardous emissions impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to hazardous emissions but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to hazardous emissions will be analyzed.

c. Hazardous Emissions Near Schools – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no hazardous emission near schools impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to hazardous emissions near schools but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to hazardous emission near schools will be analyzed.

d. Hazardous Site List - No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no hazardous site list locations impact.

Initial Study Page 51 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to hazardous site list locations but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to hazardous site list locations will be analyzed.

e. and f. Public Airport Hazards and Private Airport Hazards – *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no public and private airport hazards impact. Furthermore, the Highway 65 Corridor area is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

g. Emergency Response Plan – *Less than Significant.* The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no emergency response plan impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to an emergency response plan but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to emergency response plans will be analyzed.

h. Wildland Fires - *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no wildland fires impact because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the risk of wildland fire.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to wildland fires but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to wildland fires will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts related to hazards, hazardous materials and wildland fires as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

IX. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X	
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 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)?				X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X	
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?				X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X	

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (cont'd.) Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
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?				X	
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no grading or construction activities that would remove vegetation and expose soil to wind and water erosion and potentially impact water quality nor would there be any new structures or occupants that would be exposed to flooding. As discussed below, hydrology and water quality impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to, flood prevention and drainage requirements in the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications, the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, the State Water Resources Control Board General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit requirements, and goals and policies in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation and Safety Elements requiring the protection of new and existing

Initial Study Page 54 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

development from flood and drainage hazards, the prevention of storm drainage run-off in excess of pre-development levels, the development and application of erosion control plans and best management practices, the annexation of new development into existing drainage maintenance districts where warranted, and consultation with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and other appropriate entities.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as well as relevant standards from the City's Improvement Standards for hydrology and water quality impacts, will be applied future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be subject to the provisions of the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion Sediment Control, regulates grading activity on all property within the City of Rocklin to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other earthen materials generated or caused by surface runoff on or across the permit area; to comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and to ensure that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan, provisions of the California Building Standards Code as adopted by the City relating to grading activities, City of Rocklin improvement standards, and any applicable specific plans or other land use entitlements. This chapter (15.28) also establishes rules and regulations to control grading and erosion control activities, including fills and embankments; establishes the administrative procedure for issuance of permits; and provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and erosion control plans for all graded sites. Chapter 8.30 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, prohibits the discharge of any materials or pollutants that cause or contribute to a violation of applicable water quality standards, other than stormwater, into the municipal storm drain system or watercourse. Discharges from specified activities that do not cause or contribute to the violation of plan standards, such as landscape irrigation, lawn watering, and flows from fire suppression activities, are exempt from this prohibition.

In addition, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications that are a part of the City's development review process.

Initial Study Page 55 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Significance Conclusions:

a., c., d., e. and f. Water Quality Standards and Drainage – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no water quality standards and drainage impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts to hydrology and water quality but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to hydrology and water quality will be analyzed.

b. Groundwater Supplies – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no groundwater supply impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts to groundwater supply but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts to groundwater supply will be analyzed.

g., h., i. and j. Flooding, Tsunami, Seiche, or Mudflow – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no flooding, tsunami seiche or mudflow impact.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to flooding, tsunami seiche or mudflow but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to flooding, tsunami seiche or mudflow will be analyzed.

Furthermore, according to FEMA flood maps (Map Panels 06061CO411F and 06061CO413F, effective dates June 8, 1998) the developable portions of the Highway 65 Corridor area are located in flood zone X, which indicates that the project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and outside of the 500-year flood hazard area. The Highway 65 Corridor area is not located within the potential inundation area of any dam or levee failure, nor is the Highway 65 Corridor area located sufficiently near any significant bodies of water or steep hillsides to be at risk from inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Future development in the Highway 65 portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan under an increased trip cap scenario may result in impacts related to hydrology and water quality but will require review under CEQA at which time potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality will be analyzed. Because the proposed project does not result in any change to the boundaries of the areas previously identified for development under the Northwest

Initial Study Page 56 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Rocklin General Development Plan, it is anticipated that future development will have similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality as was analyzed in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR.

X. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, 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?				X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no change to existing land use designations of Business Professional (BP), Recreation-Conservation, Retail Commercial RC), Mixed Use (MU), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and Light Industrial (LI) that exist within the Highway 65 Corridor area. As discussed below, land use impacts would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

Initial Study Page 57 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding land use impacts.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to land use incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Division of Community – No Impact. The proposed project is located in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area within the City of Rocklin. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there is no division of community impact.

b. Plan Conflict – No Impact. The Highway 65 Corridor project site is designated Business Professional (BP), Recreation-Conservation (R-C), Retail Commercial (RC), Mixed Use (MU), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and Light Industrial (LI) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned Planned Development-Business Professional/Commercial (PD-BP/C), Planned Development Commercial (PD-C), Planned Development-Business Professional (PD-BP), Open Space (OS), and Planned Development-Light Industrial (PD-LI). The project requires a General Development Plan Amendment to allow for an increase in the trip caps that are currently in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan while still maintaining City of Rocklin traffic Level of Service standards. The proposed project does not include any proposed land use or zoning designation changes; therefore the proposed project is consistent with the site's land use and zoning designations and there would be no land use plan, policy or regulation conflict impact.

c. Habitat Plan Conflict - No Impact. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans which apply to the project site; therefore there would be no habitat plan conflict impact.

XI. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. The project site does not contain known mineral resources. As discussed below, mineral resources impacts would not be anticipated.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Mineral Resources – No Impact. The Rocklin General Plan and associated EIR analyzed the potential for “productive resources” such as, but not limited to, granite and gravel (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.6-4 through 4.6-5 and 4.6-17). The City of Rocklin planning area has no mineral resources as classified by the State Geologist. The Planning Area has no known or suspected mineral resources that would be of value to the region and to residents of the state. The project site is not delineated in the Rocklin General Plan or any other plans as a mineral resource recovery site. Mineral resources of the project site have not changed with the passage of time since the General Plan EIR was adopted. Based on this discussion, the project is not anticipated to have a mineral resources impact.

XII. <u>NOISE</u> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) 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?			X		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	
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?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. However, the proposed increase in trip caps would allow additional vehicle trips to occur on project area roadways which could lead to an increase in roadway noise levels. As discussed below, noise impacts would not be anticipated or would be less than significant.

Initial Study Page 60 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

Prior Environmental Analysis:

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of noise associated with the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included construction noise, traffic noise, operational noise, groundborne vibration, and overall increased in noise resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.5-1 through 4.5-48).

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Noise Element, which includes policies that require acoustical analyses to determine noise compatibility between land uses, application of stationary and mobile noise source sound limits/design standards, restriction of development of noise-sensitive land uses unless effective noise mitigations are incorporated into projects, and mitigation of noise levels to ensure that the noise level design standards of the Noise Element are not exceeded.

The General Plan EIR concluded that, despite these goals and policies, significant noise impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards, will result in exposure to surface transportation noise sources and stationary noise sources in excess of applicable noise standards and will contribute to cumulative transportation noise impacts within the Planning Area. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these impacts, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts associated with noise incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a., c. and d. Exposure to Noise, Increase in Noise – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed increase in trip caps would allow additional vehicle trips to occur on project area roadways which could lead to an increase in roadway noise levels. The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR analyzed roadway noise levels that would result from the development of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan and determined that

Initial Study Page 61 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

proposed residential development in close proximity to existing and proposed roadways could be exposed to exterior traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Rocklin's noise level standards and that such was considered to be a significant impact. A mitigation measure was identified in the EIR that required developers to use setbacks, barriers, or other measures as necessary to ensure that exterior and interior noise levels do not exceed the City's noise level standards, as demonstrated by a project-specific noise analysis. This mitigation measure is now applied as a condition of approval on all residential projects in the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area to ensure that the City's noise levels are met, and will continue to be applied for all future residential projects.

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan EIR also analyzed the effect that traffic from the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area would potentially have on existing City roadways and concluded that the impact would be less than significant for two reasons. Firstly, because the change in overall traffic noise levels would be less than 3 dB on the majority of the existing street system (outside of a laboratory, a 3 dB change is considered a just-perceptible difference, and a change in level of at least 5 dB is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected), and secondly, because the only roadway that was identified as having a significant increase (greater than 3 dB) in noise levels was West Stanford Ranch Road, but it was noted that existing residences along this street have fences or masonry walls shielding back yards and these fences and walls would provide noise attenuation for the increased roadway noise levels.

Cumulative traffic volumes for roadways within the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan from the increased trip cap scenario and a no increased trip cap scenario were compared and it was determined that in no instance do the traffic volumes more than double between the two scenarios. Based on acoustical principles, because a doubling of traffic volumes on a roadway is required to result in a 3 dB change and that 3 dB change is considered just-perceptible outside of laboratory conditions, the increased traffic volumes on roadways within the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area as a result of the increased trip caps are not anticipated to result in a significant increase in roadway noise levels since none of the traffic volume increases are doubled. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels and the roadway noise level increase impact is considered less than significant.

b. Exposure to Ground borne Noise and Vibration – No Impact. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity that would produce groundborne noise or vibration; therefore there would be no exposure to groundborne noise and vibration impact.

e. and f. Public and Private Airport Noise – No Impact. The City of Rocklin, including the project site, is not located in proximity to any airport or airstrip and is not subject to obtrusive noise related to airport operations; therefore, there is no airport related noise impact.

Initial Study Page 62 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

XIII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure.)			X		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. However, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density which could have population and housing impacts. As discussed below, population and housing impacts would not be anticipated or would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated population and housing impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included population growth and availability of housing opportunities (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.11-1 through 4.11-13). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in population and housing impacts, implementation of the General Plan would not contribute to a significant generation of growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections nor would it displace substantial numbers of housing units or people. Moreover, the project will not

Initial Study Page 63 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

construct off-site infrastructure that would induce substantial development, unplanned or otherwise. As such, population and housing impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Population Growth – *Less Than Significant Impact.* The Highway 65 Corridor project site is designated Business Professional (BP), Recreation-Conservation, Retail Commercial RC), Mixed Use (MU), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and Light Industrial (LI) on the General Plan land use map and is zoned Planned Development-Business Professional/Commercial (PD-BP/C), Planned Development Commercial (PD-C), Planned Development-Business Professional (PD-BP), Open Space (OS) and Planned Development-Light Industrial (PD-LI). While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional development density that could be realized under an increased trip cap scenario would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial. The additional development density would be at levels that are considered to be typical in that some of the development areas currently have their floor-to-area ratios (FAR) limited to levels below 20% and the increased trip caps would allow the FARs to increase to between 25 and 32%, which is a more typical industry FAR level. Therefore, the additional density and potential associated growth in population (employees and/or residents) and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial and there will be a less than significant population growth impact.

b. and c. Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People – *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, and future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would not occur where there is existing housing; therefore there will be no displacement of existing housing or people impact.

XIV. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Would the project 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:			X		
1. Fire protection?			X		
2. Police protection?			X		
3. Schools?			X		
4. Other public facilities?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impact:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. However, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density which could affect the provision of public services. As discussed below, public services impacts would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for fire and police protection and school and recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for fire, police and school services, provision of adequate fire flow, and increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-1 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in public services and facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level

Initial Study Page 65 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

through compliance with state and local standards related to the provision of public services and facilities and through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to public services and facilities.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to the California Fire Code, the California Health and Safety Code, Chapters 8.12 and 8.20 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, and goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety and Public Services and Facilities Elements requiring studies of infrastructure and public facility needs, proportional share participation in the financial costs of public services and facilities, coordination of private development projects with public facilities and services needed to serve the project, maintaining inter-jurisdictional cooperation and coordination and requiring certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special needs to mitigate the demands/needs.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to public services incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for the project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a., 1 Fire Protection – *Less Than Significant Impact.* While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could increase the need for fire protection services. The City collects construction taxes for use in acquiring capital facilities such as fire suppression equipment. Operation and maintenance funding for fire suppression is provided through financing districts and from general fund sources. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure fire protection service to the future development and a less than significant fire protection impact.

Initial Study Page 66 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

a., 2) Police Protection – *Less Than Significant Impact.* While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could increase the need for police patrol and police services. Funding for police services is primarily from the general fund, and is provided for as part of the City’s budget process. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure police protection services to the future development and a less than significant police protection impact.

a., 3) Schools – *Less Than Significant Impact.* While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could increase the need for school services. The future development will be required to pay applicable school impact fees in effect at the time of building permit issuance to finance school facilities. Participation in these funding mechanisms, as applicable, will reduce school impacts to a less than significant level as a matter of state law.

a., 4) Other Public Facilities – *Less Than Significant Impact.* While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not be a level substantial enough as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing to require the need for other public facilities. Therefore, there would be a less than significant other public facilities impact.

XV. <u>RECREATION</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X		
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. However, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. As discussed below, recreation impacts would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

The General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-30 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in recreation facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to recreation facilities. The General Plan has established a parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 population, and has adopted goals and policies to insure that this standard is met. These goals and policies call for the provision of new park and recreational facilities as needed by new development through parkland dedication and the payment of park and recreation fees. These programs and practices are recognized in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, which mitigates these impacts to a less than significant level.

Initial Study Page 68 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to recreation incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Increase Park Usage and Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities – No Impact. While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density. However, the additional density and potential associated growth in population (employees and/or residents) would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

In addition, the City of Rocklin provides parkland dedication and/or collection of park fees to mitigate for the increased recreational impacts of new residential developments at the time that a parcel or subdivision map is recorded. Employees and residents of the future development could utilize City recreational facilities but the use is anticipated to be minimal and is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of existing facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor is the minimal use anticipated to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore there will be a less than significant increased park usage impact.

Initial Study Page 69 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

XVI. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit)?		X			
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X	
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?				X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, the proposed project is anticipated to cause increases in traffic because the existing automobile trip caps for development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area will be increased, but not to a degree that would significantly affect level of service (LOS) standards.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Circulation Element, and include policies that require the monitoring of traffic on City streets to determine improvements needed to maintain an acceptable level of service, updating the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and traffic impact fees, providing for inflationary adjustments to the City's traffic impact fees, maintaining a minimum level of service (LOS) of "C" for all signalized intersections during the PM peak period on an average weekday, maintaining street design standards, and interconnecting traffic signals and consideration of the use of roundabouts where financially feasible and warranted to provide flexibility in controlling traffic movements at intersections.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on utility and service systems incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or

Initial Study Page 71 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

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

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Fehr and Peers, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in transportation, prepared a traffic impact analysis of the proposed project. Their report, dated May 5, 2016, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and is incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by this reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Fehr and Peers has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Fehr and Peers report, which is summarized below.

Daily Trip Generation

An estimate of the proposed project's daily trip generation has been made based on trip generation rates derived from the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan and consultation with City staff regarding approved and potential future land use changes. No General Plan Amendments or rezones of properties to other categories are proposed at this time. The table below identifies the resulting trip generation estimates for the proposed project. As shown, the proposed increased trip cap scenario project would generate an additional 20,967 daily trips beyond the daily trips associated with the current trip cap level.

Initial Study Page 72 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

DEVELOPMENT AREA #	LOCATION	CURRENT AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT) TRIP CAP	PROPOSED AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT) TRIP CAP
104	North of Whitney Ranch Parkway	14,626	20,127
106	North of Whitney Ranch Parkway	6,982	9,275
107A	West of University Drive	8,313 for 107 A and B combined	12,355
107B	East of University Drive	8,313 for 107 A and B combined	2,310
108A	West of University Drive	14,764 for 108 A and B combined	14,452
108B	East of University Drive	14,764 for 108 A and B combined	1,566
110	North of Syracuse Drive	3,800	1,764
113A	Nearest to Caltrans Right of Way	8,325 for 113 A, B and C combined	2,711
113B	West of University Drive	8,325 for 113 A, B and C combined	5,785
113C	East of University Drive	8,325 for 113 A, B and C combined	7,425
114	North of Sunset Boulevard	11,473	11,480
115	Atherton Tech Center	8,760	8,760
TOTALS	-	77,043	98,010
Note: Development areas 105, 109, 112 and 116 are open space parcels which are excluded from the above list. Source: Fehr & Peers, 2016			

Since the time that the original trip caps were adopted in 2002, some changes in land use have occurred introducing single family residential and mixed use land use categories that will accommodate multi-family development allowing for a greater internalization of trips within the area than previously assumed. A clearer picture of the estimated buildout of William Jessup University has also evolved and significant Industrial development is no longer anticipated. An updated travel demand model has also been created and more realistic modeling which factors in aspects such as right turn on red movements has been applied. The updated analysis has determined that there is additional trip capacity beyond the trip caps that were originally identified in the Northwest Rocklin GDP that would still allow the area to maintain an acceptable level of service on the City's roadway system.

Study Intersections

Eight signalized intersections were selected for the traffic study. These intersections were selected based on their proximity to the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area, their anticipated use by project trips, and their susceptibility to being impacted (i.e., intersections operating in the LOS C range under cumulative conditions in the General Plan).

Initial Study Page 73 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

The table below displays the vehicle to capacity (v/c) ratio range associated with each Level of Service (LOS) grade.

VOLUME TO CAPACITY (V/C) RATIO AND LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	V/C RATIO RANGE
A	≤ 0.60
B	0.61 - 0.70
C	0.71 - 0.80
D	0.81 – 0.90
E	0.91 – 1.00
F	> 1.00
Source: City of Rocklin	

General Plan Draft EIR (2011) Traffic Conditions

The table below displays the existing PM peak hour Level of Service (LOS) at the signalized study intersections, as presented in the City of Rocklin General Plan Draft EIR (2011). As shown, each intersection operates at LOS B or better, which meets the City's LOS C policy.

PM PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – GENERAL PLAN DRAFT EIR (2011) CONDITIONS		
INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	EXISTING CONDITIONS¹ V/C / LOS
Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue	Signal	0.34 / A
Sunset Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road	Signal	0.47 / A
Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard	Signal	0.35 / A
Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard	Signal	0.68 / B
Whitney Ranch Parkway/University Avenue	Intersection did not exist when General Plan EIR was prepared	
Whitney Ranch Parkway/Wildcat Boulevard	Signal	0.18 / A
Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive	Signal	0.18 / A
Wildcat Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road	Signal	0.46 / A
Notes: V/C – Volume-to-Capacity Ratio; LOS = Level of Service		
¹ Reported results from the City of Rocklin General Plan Draft EIR (2011)		

Initial Study Page 74 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Future (Cumulative Year 2030) Traffic Conditions

The City of Rocklin 2030 General Plan cumulative model was used to forecast cumulative year conditions at intersections within and adjacent to the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area. The table below compares cumulative PM peak hour Levels of Service at study area intersections with and without the proposed project (with approved and potential land use changes and General Plan Mitigations, and with buildout of adopted General Plan with General Plan Mitigations, respectively).

PM PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – CUMULATIVE (2030) CONDITIONS			
INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	2030 GENERAL PLAN WITH EIR MITIGATION ¹ V/C / LOS	2030 WITH APPROVED AND POTENTIAL LAND USE CHANGES ² V/C / LOS
Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue	Signal	0.77 / c	0.95 / E
Sunset Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road	Signal	0.80 / C	0.71 / C
Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard	Signal	0.71 / C	0.84 / D
Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard	Signal	0.79 / C	0.91 / E
Whitney Ranch Parkway/University Avenue	Signal	0.64 / B	0.66 / B
Whitney Ranch Parkway/Wildcat Boulevard	Signal	0.67 / B	0.78 / C
Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive	Signal	0.79 / C	0.98 / E
Wildcat Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road	Signal	0.80 / C	0.83 / D
Notes: V/C – Volume-to-Capacity Ratio; LOS = Level of Service BOLD represents an intersection LOS that is worse than the City’s LOS “C” policy. ¹ Reported results from the City of Rocklin General Plan Draft EIR (2011) ² Approved and potential land use changes include various rezoning within the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area consistent with the increased trip caps depicted in daily trip generation table above. This scenario also assumes various background and roadway network changes in the South Placer area, which also affect cumulative traffic forecasts. This scenario assumes identical lane configurations, signal phasing and right turn treatments as GP EIR with mitigation scenario.			
Initial Study Page 75 Reso. No.		Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007	

As shown, under an increased trip cap scenario (2030 with approved and potential land use changes), the intersections of Sunset Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road, Whitney Ranch Parkway/University Avenue, and Whitney Ranch Parkway/Wildcat Boulevard are projected to operate at LOS B or C, which is within the City's LOS C policy. The intersections of Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard, Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive and Wildcat Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road are projected to operate at LOS D or E, which would not meet the City's LOS C policy.

One particularly important component of the intersection operations calculations is the treatment of right-turns. The Traffix software program used for this analysis allows for right-turn movements to be considered as: "ignore", "include", or "overlap". The following describes conditions associated with each treatment option:

- Ignore – the turn lane is channelized and has its own receiving lane. This treatment completely removes the right-turn volume from the LOS calculation.
- Include – right-turns are made from a shared through lane, or prohibited from being made on red. This treatment includes the entire right-turn volume in the LOS calculation.
- Overlap – right-turns are made from a turn pocket (but not channelized), have a complimentary/opposing left-turn phase, and are permitted to turn right on red. This treatment includes a portion of the right-turn volume in the LOS calculation. This treatment is also used for intersections with right-turn overlap (arrow) signal phasing.

As part of the traffic impact analysis each intersection's LOS calculations were reviewed to determine whether right turns were being treated correctly. In instances in which the right-turn movement clearly qualified as being "ignore" or "include", this option was selected. For all other right-turns, a 20 percent right-turn-on-red (RTOR) reduction was conservatively chosen. This was selected over the use of "overlap" because the resulting RTOR percentages would have been excessively high and unrealistic.

This change in methodology resulted in the determination that the LOS D identified at the intersection of Wildcat Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road is in fact LOS C, which meets the City's LOS C policy. Therefore, the intersections that exceed the City's LOS C policy and require mitigation include Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard and Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Conflict with Performance of Circulation System – Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Based upon the results of the traffic impact analysis summarized above, the

Initial Study Page 76 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

intersections of Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard and Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive are projected to operate at LOS D or E, which would not meet the City's LOS C policy. However, improvements to achieve LOS C operations at each impacted signalized study intersection have been identified and are discussed in the mitigation measure below. It should be noted that all of the traffic mitigation measures identified below can be accommodated with existing and/or planned City roadway rights-of-way.

To address the exceedance of the City's LOS C policy at the intersections of Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard and Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project:

XVI.-1 The following intersections shall be added to the City's Capital Improvement Program Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program as part of the implementation of General Plan Policy C-8:

Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue

- *Restripe the southbound University Avenue approach from a planned 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes and 1 right turn lane to consist of 2 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 right turn lane. The suggested restriping simply reassigns lanes on the SB approach and does not require any further widening beyond which has already been planned. Eastbound Sunset Boulevard currently has a sufficient number of receiving lanes to accommodate this restriping without requiring any additional ROW or restriping.*
- *Provide a right-turn only driveway on the north side of Sunset Boulevard west of University Avenue to serve the retail parcel (i.e., acts to reduce southbound right-turn volume).*

Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard

- *Restripe the southbound West Oaks Boulevard approach from (a planned) 2 left turn lanes, 2 through lanes, and 1 right turn lane to consist of 3 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 right turn lane.*
- *Restripe the northbound West Oaks Boulevard approach from 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes, and 1 right turn lane to consist of 2 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 through/right lane to achieve proper lane alignments.*

Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard

- *The westbound Sunset Boulevard approach currently consists of one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane. Add a second left turn lane on westbound Sunset Boulevard (constructed from existing median and minor restriping/narrowing of existing lanes).*
- *Convert eastbound Sunset Boulevard channelized right turn to a signal controlled movement with overlap arrow to better accommodate westbound dual left-turn movement (see Figure 4 for illustration of improvement).*

Initial Study Page 77 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive

- *Restripe the eastbound Ranch View Drive approach from 1 left turn lane and 1 through/right lane to consist of 1 left turn lane, 1 shared left/through lane, and 1 dedicated right-turn lane.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure will reduce impacts to the exceedance of the City's LOS C policy at the intersections of Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard and Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive to a less than significant level.

Future development projects, including future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario will be conditioned to contribute its fair share to the cost of circulation improvements via the existing citywide traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fee program that would be applied as a uniformly applied development policy and standard. The traffic impact mitigation fee program is one of the various methods that the City of Rocklin uses for financing improvements identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP, which is overseen by the City's Public Services Department, is updated periodically to respond to changing conditions and to assure that growth in the City and surrounding jurisdictions does not degrade the level of service on the City's roadways. The roadway improvements that are identified in the CIP in response to anticipated growth in population and development in the City are consistent with the City's Circulation Element. The traffic impact fee program collects funds from new development in the City to finance a portion of the roadway improvements that result from traffic generated by the new development. Fees are calculated on a citywide basis, differentiated by type of development in relationship to their relative traffic impacts. The intent of the fee is to provide an equitable means of ensuring that future development contributes their fair share of roadway improvements, so that the City's General Plan Circulation policies and quality of life can be maintained.

South Placer Regional Transportation Authority

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

Initial Study Page 78 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Highway 65 Interchange Improvement Fee

The cities of Rocklin and Roseville and Placer County have established the “Bizz Johnson” Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority that has adopted an interchange traffic fee on all new development within Rocklin, Roseville and affected portions of Placer County. The purpose of the fee is to finance four interchanges on State Route 65 to reduce the impact of increased traffic from local development; future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be subject to payment of such a fee.

b. Conflict with Congestion Management Plan – No Impact. The City of Rocklin does not have an applicable congestion management program that has been established by a county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; therefore there is no conflict with an applicable congestion management program impact.

c. Air Traffic Patterns – No Impact. While future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario may result in an increase in traffic levels, the proposed project is not anticipated to have any impacts on air traffic because it is not located near an airport or within a flight path. In addition, the proposed project will not result in a change in location of planned development that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is no change in air traffic patterns impact.

d. and e. Hazards and Emergency Access – Less Than Significant Impact. While future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario may result in an increase in traffic levels, proposed projects are evaluated by the City’s Engineering Services Manager to assess such items as hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. In addition, proposed projects are evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin’s Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant hazard or emergency access impact.

f. Alternative Modes of Transportation – Less Than Significant Impact. While future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario may result in an increase in traffic levels, proposed projects are evaluated by City staff to assess potential conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and whether proposed projects would decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Through these reviews and any required changes, there will be a less than significant alternative modes of transportation impact.

XVII. <u>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X		
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X		

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity; therefore there will be no ground disturbance that could affect unknown/undiscovered tribal cultural resources. As discussed below, tribal cultural resources impacts would not be anticipated or would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. and b. Tribal Cultural Resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.* Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52, Gatto 2014), as of July 1, 2015 Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3 require public agencies to consult with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American tribes for the purpose of mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources; that consultation process is described in part below:

Initial Study Page 81 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section (Public Resources Code Section 21080.1 (d))

As of the writing of this document, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), the Lone Band of Miwok Indians (IBMI) and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (TMDCI) are the only tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area that have requested notification. Consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 (d) and per AB-52, the City of Rocklin provided formal notification of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) project and the opportunity to consult on it to the designated contacts of the UAIC, IBMI and TMDCI in a letter received by those organizations on May 5, 2016, May 5, 2016 and August 22, 2016, respectively. The UAIC, IBMI and TMDCI had 30 days to request consultation on the project pursuant to AB-52 and they did not respond prior to June 6, 2016, June 6, 2016 and September 22, 2016, respectively, the end of the 30-day periods. As such, the City of Rocklin has complied with AB-52 and may proceed with the CEQA process for this project per PRC Section 21082.3 (d) (3). Given that the UAIC, IBMI and TMDCI did not submit a formal request for consultation on the proposed project within the required 30 day period, that no other tribes have submitted a formal request to receive notification from the City of Rocklin pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, and that there have been no other concerns expressed regarding tribal cultural resources in the project area, the project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. Therefore, the project's impact on tribal cultural resources is considered less than significant.

Initial Study Page 82 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

XVIII. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		
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?			X		
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?			X		
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X		
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?			X		
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify the trip caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. However, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density which could affect the need for utility and service systems. As discussed below, utility and service systems impacts would be less than significant.

Prior Environmental Review:

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on utility and service systems incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a., b. and e. Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements, Exceed Wastewater Treatment Facility, Wastewater Capacity – Less Than Significant Impact. While the proposed project

Initial Study Page 84 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density that could generate additional wastewater treatment needs. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

The proposed project site is located within the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) service area for sewer. SPMUD has a Master Plan, which is periodically updated, to provide sewer to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary, and includes the option of constructing additional treatment plants. SPMUD collects connection fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities. Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario is responsible for complying with all requirements of SPMUD, including compliance with wastewater treatment standards established by the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board. The South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) was created by the City of Roseville, Placer County and SPMUD to provide regional wastewater and recycled water facilities in southwestern Placer County. The regional facilities overseen by the SPWA include the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants, both of which receive flows from SPMUD (and likewise from Rocklin). To project future regional wastewater needs, the SPWA prepared the *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation* (Evaluation) in June 2007. The Evaluation indicates that as of June 2004, flows to both the wastewater treatment plants were below design flows. Specifically, the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) had an average dry weather flow of 10 million gallons/day (mgd) and an average dry weather capacity of 18 mgd, while the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant had an average dry weather flow of 7 mgd, and an average dry weather capacity of 12 mgd. According to SPMUD, in 2009 the Dry Creek WWTP had an inflow of 10.3 mgd, with Rocklin's portion being 2.4 mgd, and the Pleasant Grove WWTP had an inflow of 7.0 mgd, with Rocklin's portion being 2.0 mgd. Consequently, both plants are well within their operating capacities and there remains adequate capacity to accommodate the projected wastewater flows from future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario.

c. New Stormwater Facilities – Less Than Significant Impact. While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density that could generate the need for additional stormwater facilities. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

Initial Study Page 85 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would be conditioned to require connection into the City's storm drain system, with Best Management Practices features located within the project's drainage system at a point prior to where the project site runoff will enter the City's storm drain system. Other than on-site improvements, new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities beyond those identified in the master drainage studies prepared for the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area would not be required as a result of this project.

d. Water Supplies – Less Than Significant Impact. While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density that could result in a need for additional water supplies. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing.

The proposed project is located within the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) service area. The PCWA has a Master Plan, which is periodically updated, to provide water to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary, and includes the option of constructing additional treatment plants. The PCWA collects hook-up fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities.

The PCWA service area is divided into five zones that provide treated and raw water to Colfax, Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln, small portion of Roseville, unincorporated areas of western Placer County, and a small community in Martis Valley near Truckee. The proposed project is located in Zone 1, which is the largest of the five zones. Zone 1 provides water service to Auburn, Bowman, Ophir, Newcastle, Penryn, Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln, and portions of Granite Bay.

PCWA has planned for growth in the City of Rocklin and sized the water supply infrastructure to meet this growth (PCWA 2006). The project site would be served by the Foothill WTP, which treats water diverted from the American River Pump Station near Auburn, and estimated maximum daily water treatment demands from future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario would not exceed the plant's permitted capacity. Because the proposed project would be served by a water treatment plant that has adequate capacity to meet the project's projected demand and would not require the construction of a new water treatment plant, the proposed project's water supply and treatment facility impacts would be considered less than significant.

f. Landfill Capacity – Less Than Significant Impact. While the proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity, future development in the

Initial Study Page 86 Reso. No.	Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007
------------------------------------	---

Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario could result in additional development density that could result in a need for additional landfill capacity. However, the additional density would occur in areas that are already designated and planned for growth and would not occur on a scale that would be considered substantial as explained above in Section XIII. Population and Housing

The Western Regional landfill, which serves the Rocklin area, has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. The estimated closure date for the landfill is approximately 2036. Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario with urban land uses was included in the lifespan and capacity calculations of the landfill, and a less than significant landfill capacity impact would be anticipated.

Federal and State regulations regarding solid waste consist of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations and the California Integrated Waste Management Act regulating waste reduction. These regulations primarily affect local agencies and other agencies such as the Landfill Authority. Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario will comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations regarding trash and waste and other nuisance-related issues as may be applicable. Recology would provide garbage collection services to the future development, provided their access requirements are met.

XIX. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)?			X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		

Conclusion:

a., b. and c. Degradation of Environment Quality, Cumulatively Considerable Impacts, Adverse Effects to Humans – *Less Than Significant Impact*. Development in the South Placer region as a whole, including future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario, will contribute to regional air pollutant emissions, thereby delaying attainment of Federal and State air quality standards, regardless of development activity in the City of Rocklin and application of

mitigation measures; as a result, the General Plan EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole, including future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario, will result in cumulative, long-term impacts on biological resources (vegetation and wildlife), due to the introduction of domestic landscaping, homes, paved surfaces, and the relatively constant presence of people and pets, all of which negatively impact vegetation and wildlife habitat; as a result, the General Plan EIR determined that there would be cumulative significant and unavoidable biological resource impacts. Buildout of the proposed project represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the EIR.

Development in the City, including future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario, will substantially alter viewsheds and vistas as mixed urban development occurs on vacant land. In addition, new development will also generate new sources of light and glare; as a result, the General Plan EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts. Buildout of the proposed project represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the EIR.

The preceding analysis demonstrates that the effects discussed in the Mandatory Findings of Significance checklist section above will not occur as a consequence of the project. Future development in the Highway 65 Corridor portion of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area under an increased trip cap scenario will occur in locations that are mostly surrounded by developed land. Specifically, the proposed project does not have the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

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

The approval of the proposed project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effect on human beings. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Section 5. References:

City of Rocklin General Plan, October 2012

City of Rocklin General Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report, August 2011

City of Rocklin General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, August 2012

City of Rocklin Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan, July 2002 and subsequently amended via City Council Ordinances 882, 884, 898, 892, 932 and 941

City of Rocklin Zoning Ordinance, Title 17 of the Rocklin Municipal Code

Fehr & Peers, Final Transportation Impact Analysis for the Northwest Rocklin Area General Development Plan, May 2016

Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Area, Draft Environmental Impact Report, October 2001

Northwest Rocklin Annexation (Sunset Ranchos) Area, Final Environmental Impact Report, March 2002

Raney Planning and Management, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Project, October 2016

Attachments

Attachment A – Project Vicinity Map

Attachment B – Highway 65 Corridor Parcel Number Map

Initial Study Page 90 Reso. No.	<i>Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) PDG2016-0007</i>
------------------------------------	--

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

NORTHWEST ROCKLIN GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT (TRIP CAPS) (PDG2016-0007)

Project Name and Description

The Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps) project proposes an amendment to the North West Rocklin General Development Plan to modify traffic caps applied to land within the Highway 65 Corridor portion (approximately 528 acres) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan area while still maintaining City of Rocklin traffic Level of Service standards. The proposed project does not include any specific development proposal or development activity. This project will require a General Development Plan Amendment entitlement. For more detail, please refer to the Project Description set forth in Section 3 of the Initial Study.

Project Location

The project site is generally located in the northwest portion of the City of Rocklin, specifically within the Highway 65 Corridor (Development Areas 104-116) of the Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan. The area is generally bounded by State Route 65 (SR65) on the west, just west of Wildcat Boulevard on the east, the Rocklin/Lincoln City Limits on the north, and Sunset Boulevard on the south.

Project Proponent's Name

The applicants and property owners are Orchard Creek Investors LLC/Fulcrum, Evergreen Management Company and William Jessup University.

Basis for Mitigated Negative Declaration Determination

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

Date Circulated for Review: _____ October 13, 2016 _____

Date Adopted: _____

Signature: _____

Marc Mondell, Economic and Community Development Department Director

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
Northwest Rocklin General Development Plan Amendment (Trip Caps)
(PDG2016-0007)

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

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

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

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

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

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

To address the exceedance of the emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and reduce them below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project:

III.-1 In conjunction with submittal of a development application for any projects within the Northwest Rocklin Area that exceed the 2002 trip cap (as calculated using the trip generation rates provided in the May 2016 Final Transportation Impact Analysis for the Northwest Rocklin Area General Development Plan), the applicant shall prepare and submit an Air Quality Emissions Estimate identifying the project's increase in estimated NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from mobile sources as compared to those allowed under the 2002 trip cap. The estimated increase in mobile source emissions shall remain at or below 20.7 percent for NO_x and 17.7 percent for PM₁₀. If the emissions estimate identifies an increase beyond those identified above, the applicant shall submit an Air Quality Reduction Plan sufficient to reduce NO_x and/or PM₁₀ emissions to within the allowable emissions increases. The measures included in the Air Quality Reduction Plan would be anticipated to focus on the reduction of mobile source emissions by including project elements that encourage alternative modes of transportation, promote non-motorized transportation and result in the reduction of number of vehicle trips as well as vehicle trip lengths. The Air Quality Reduction Plan may also include payment of mitigation fees into the PCAPCD's Off-site Air Quality Mitigation Fund as a method of reducing NO_x emissions. PCAPCD's Off-site Air Quality Mitigation supports fleet Fee program supports fleet modernizations, repowers, retrofits, and fleet expansions of heavy duty on- and off-road mobile vehicles/equipment; alternative fuels infrastructure or low emission fuel purchases; new or expanded alternative transit service programs; light-duty low emission vehicle (LEV) programs; public education; repower of agricultural pump engines, and other beneficial air quality projects. Mitigation fees collected from land use developments by the PCAPCD are distributed through the District's annual Clean Air Grant (CAG) Program, which would help to reduce regional NO_x emissions.

IMPLEMENTATION:

In conjunction with submittal of a development application for any projects within the Northwest Rocklin Area that exceed the 2002 trip cap (as calculated using the trip generation rates provided in the May 2016 Final Transportation Impact Analysis for the Northwest Rocklin Area General Development Plan), the project applicant shall prepare and submit an Air Quality Emissions Estimate identifying the project's increase in estimated NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from mobile sources as compared to those allowed under the 2002 trip cap. The estimated increase in mobile source emissions shall remain at or below 20.7 percent for NO_x and 17.7 percent for PM₁₀. If the emissions estimate identifies an increase beyond those identified above, the applicant shall submit an Air Quality Reduction Plan sufficient to reduce NO_x and/or PM₁₀

emissions to within the allowable emissions increases. The City shall incorporate the findings of the Air Quality Emissions Estimate into the project's conditions of approval.

RESPONSIBILITY

City of Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department

City of Rocklin Public Services Department

Applicants/Developers

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Transportation/Traffic:

To address the exceedance of the City's LOS C policy at the intersections of Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue, Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard and Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project:

XVI.-1 The following intersections shall be added to the City's Capital Improvement Program Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program as part of the implementation of General Plan Policy C-8:

Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue

- *Restripe the southbound University Avenue approach from a planned 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes and 1 right turn lane to consist of 2 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 right turn lane. The suggested restriping simply reassigns lanes on the SB approach and does not require any further widening beyond which has already been planned. Eastbound Sunset Boulevard currently has a sufficient number of receiving lanes to accommodate this restriping without requiring any additional ROW or restriping.*
- *Provide a right-turn only driveway on the north side of Sunset Boulevard west of University Avenue to serve the retail parcel (i.e., acts to reduce southbound right-turn volume).*

Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard

- *Restripe the southbound West Oaks Boulevard approach from (a planned) 2 left turn lanes, 2 through lanes, and 1 right turn lane to consist of 3 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 right turn lane.*
- *Restripe the northbound West Oaks Boulevard approach from 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes, and 1 right turn lane to consist of 2 left turn lanes, 1 through lane, and 1 through/right lane to achieve proper lane alignments.*

Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard

- *The westbound Sunset Boulevard approach currently consists of one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane. Add a second left turn lane on westbound Sunset Boulevard (constructed from existing median and minor restriping/narrowing of existing lanes).*
- *Convert eastbound Sunset Boulevard channelized right turn to a signal controlled movement with overlap arrow to better accommodate westbound dual left-turn movement (see Figure 4 for illustration of improvement).*

Wildcat Boulevard/Ranch View Drive

- *Restripe the eastbound Ranch View Drive approach from 1 left turn lane and 1 through/right lane to consist of 1 left turn lane, 1 shared left/through lane, and 1 dedicated right-turn lane.*

IMPLEMENTATION:

The City shall add the above referenced intersection mitigation measures and their associated costs to the City's Capital Improvement Program Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program as a part of that program's next update. Subsequently, development projects subject to the Traffic Impact Fee Mitigation Fee program shall be assessed an appropriate fee to ensure fair share payment.

RESPONSIBILITY

City of Rocklin Economic and Community Development Department
Applicants/Developers

MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT FORMS

Project Title:

Mitigation Measures:

Completion Date: (Insert date or time period that mitigation measures were completed)

Responsible Person:

(Insert name and title)

Monitoring/Reporting:

Community Development Director

Effectiveness Comments:

