
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides an overview of the environmental analysis for the proposed City of Rocklin General Plan Update, which also includes the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Rocklin Redevelopment Project and the associated Climate Action Plan (CAP) document. These components are collectively referred to as the “project” or “proposed project.” For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Sections 4.1 through 4.15 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of this Draft EIR.

2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will provide, to the greatest extent possible, an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The EIR analysis focuses on potential environmental impacts that could arise from implementation of the General Plan Update through development of the land uses within the Planning Area, as regulated and guided by General Plan policies and action items, as well as implementation of the Sixth Amendment and the CAP. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of an updated General Plan, the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Rocklin Redevelopment Project, and the associated Climate Action Plan document. The updated City of Rocklin General Plan would replace the existing General Plan, which was last comprehensively updated in 1991. Based on the age of the plan and the rapid rate of development experienced in the city since the early 1990s (and the associated changes in physical and regulatory conditions), the City decided to initiate the General Plan update process in 2001. In February 2005, the City initiated a new planning effort focusing on development of a land use and zoning strategy specifically for the Downtown Rocklin Area. The City completed preparation of the initial planning documents for the Downtown Rocklin Plan including the Draft Downtown Rocklin Plan Regulating Code and Implementation Strategy. The City of Rocklin’s General Plan Update builds off of the General Plan Background Report, a Constraints, Opportunities and Options Report, implementation of a public opinion survey, and the Draft Downtown Rocklin Plan Regulating Code and Implementation Strategy.

The proposed City of Rocklin General Plan Update comprises a Land Use Diagram (see Section 3.0, Project Description) and a policy document that contains seven “policy” elements. Each of the elements identifies goals and associated policies and action items. State law requires that general plans address seven topics: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The Rocklin General Plan Update covers all of these topics by combining open space, conservation, and recreation into one element and including an optional element covering public services and facilities. A brief description and goals for each element are as follows:

LAND USE

The Land Use Element serves as the basis for determining service requirements, including plans for future streets and roads, water and sewer, schools, and police and fire protection services. It is the determining factor for the future transportation system, as well as future noise compatibility issues. The proposed Land Use Element includes goals relating to all varieties of land use and identifies a number of special planning areas and planning documents that have been

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

established as part of the community planning process. These areas and documents include the Rocklin Downtown Revitalization Plan and Update, the Rocklin Civic Center Area Plan, the Rocklin Government Center, the Rocklin Redevelopment Plan Area, and the Front Street Historical Area Master Plan.

OPEN SPACE, CONSERVATION, AND RECREATION

The Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element provides a description of the lands and water that are unimproved and are to be devoted to natural uses through General Plan land use designations, and a description of existing and planned parks, recreation sites and facilities. Open space, conservation, and recreation are combined in one element because the topics they cover are closely related. The proposed General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element includes policies for managed production of mineral resources, as well as conservation and protection of historic, geologic, and cultural resources.

CIRCULATION

The Circulation Element provides a description of streets and roads, highways, transit services, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and other transportation services and facilities within the city and the Planning Area. This element provides a plan for the future transportation, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian services and facilities necessary to accommodate and serve the development of the city envisioned in the Land Use Element. The proposed Circulation Element has revised the existing level of service (LOS) policy, which currently reads: "To maintain a minimum traffic LOS 'C' for all streets and intersections, except for intersections located within one-half-mile from direct access to an interstate freeway where a LOS 'D' will be acceptable." While it is still the City policy to maintain a minimum traffic LOS C for its signalized intersections, it has redefined the exceptions to that policy in the proposed Circulation Element in Policy C-10. The proposed Circulation Element includes the removal of two existing planned circulation improvements known as the Argonaut Avenue extension to Delmar Avenue and the extension of Rocklin Road to Whitney Boulevard.

HOUSING

The Housing Element provides policies related to the provision of housing for all income levels as well as provisions that are state mandated. The Housing Element was adopted separately on March 9, 2010, and the required environmental review for the Housing Element was completed at that time.

COMMUNITY SAFETY

The Community Safety Element identifies potential natural and human-created hazards, and describes activities and services that provide protection from these hazards. Topics addressed in this element include emergency preparedness, homeland security, flooding, hazardous materials/contaminated sites, fire hazards, seismic and geologic hazards, and other hazards.

NOISE

The Noise Element is used to guide decisions regarding land use and the location of new roads and transit facilities, since they are commonly sources of excessive noise levels. Noise levels from existing land uses, including mining and industrial activities, must be closely analyzed to ensure

compatibility with planned land uses. The purpose of the Noise Element is to limit the exposure of the community to excessive noise levels.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The Public Services and Facilities Element provides a description of existing public services and facilities, their locations, and plans for and locations of future expansions to existing services and facilities. The Public Services and Facilities Element is an optional element of the General Plan. It provides a logical framework for organizing plans and policies regarding infrastructure, law enforcement, fire protection, emergency response, schools, refuse collection and disposal, utilities, storm drainage, libraries, and cemeteries. It also addresses methods of financing installation, expansion, maintenance, and operation of public facilities, as well as provision of public services.

2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. Further, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "No Project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. This alternatives analysis provides a comparative analysis between the project and the selected alternatives. The Draft EIR qualitatively evaluates the following other land use alternatives, which include:

- ***Alternative 1 – Existing General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative):*** Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan Update and its associated Land Use Diagram would not be adopted and the City would continue to operate and build out under its existing 1991 General Plan.
- ***Alternative 2 – Elimination of Mixed Use Designation Alternative:*** Under this alternative, the proposed Mixed Use land use designation for the Downtown Rocklin Plan Area would not be implemented and land uses in this area would retain their current land use designations under the existing General Plan. All other aspects of the proposed General Plan Update (updated policy document and other changes to the Land Use Diagram and circulation system) would remain in place under this alternative.
- ***Alternative 3 – Rocklin Road and Argonaut Avenue Extensions Alternative:*** Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan Update and associated Land Use Diagram would be the same as the proposed project with a modified roadway network. Two roadway extensions would be included: extending Rocklin Road from its current terminus to Whitney Boulevard and extending Argonaut Drive from its current terminus to Delmar Avenue.
- ***Alternative 4 – Rocklin Road Extension Alternative:*** Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan Update and associated Land Use Diagram would be the same as the proposed project with a modified roadway network that would extend Rocklin Road from its current terminus to Whitney Boulevard.
- ***Alternative 5 – Argonaut Avenue Extension Alternative:*** Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan Update and associated Land Use Diagram would be the same as the proposed project with a modified roadway network that would extend Argonaut Avenue from its current terminus to Delmar Avenue.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City of Rocklin was identified as the lead agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Rocklin prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the City of Rocklin General Plan Update that was circulated for public review on July 31, 2008. The NOP included a summary of probable effects on the environment from the implementation of the project. Section 1.0, Introduction, provides a summary of issues and areas of concern related to the proposed General Plan and the Draft EIR, presented to the City by agencies and the public during the NOP review period. The complete text of the NOP and NOP comments are included as **Appendix A** to this Draft EIR.

Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in the preparation of the EIR. The issues raised in the comments on the NOP included: air quality and climate change (greenhouse gas emissions, global warming, solar requirements, compliance with AB 32); land use (impacts to adjacent communities); wastewater (evaluation of existing collection, conveyance and treatment facilities, system upgrades, recycled water requirements); hydrology/water quality/flooding (best management practices, net increases in floodways and drainages, peak flows, impacts to stormwater facilities, alteration of floodplain boundaries); traffic/safety (railroad right-of-way and pedestrian safety, level of service at intersections and railroad crossings, mass transit, state highway impacts, regional transportation facilities, fair share funding); oak tree preservation; agricultural resources and farmland (protected farmland, conservation easements, LESA model, current and past practices, Williamson Act contracts); cultural and historical resources; hazards; open space and conservation; construction-related impacts to air quality and noise; capital facilities improvements and funding; alternatives (reduction of impacts to traffic and circulation, agricultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, wastewater collection, treatment, disposal, recycled water storage and distribution); and growth inducement.

2.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 2.0-1 displays a summary of impacts for the proposed project, applicable City of Rocklin General Plan Update policies, and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance is indicated both before and after the implementation of each mitigation measure.

For detailed discussions of all mitigation measures and of proposed General Plan policies that would provide mitigation for each type of environmental impact addressed in this DEIR, refer to the appropriate environmental topic section of this DEIR (i.e., Sections 4.1 through 4.15).

**TABLE 2.0
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
4.1 Land Use				
Impact 4.1.1 Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	None Applicable	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project could create conflicts between adjacent land uses including unincorporated Placer County, the City of Lincoln, Town of Loomis, and City of Roseville. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy LU-6, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-14, Policy LU-15, Policy LU-16, Policy LU-18, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-26, Policy LU-36, Policy LU-37, Policy LU-46, Policy LU-57, Policy LU-58, Policy LU-59, Policy LU-60, and Policy LU-67	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.1.3 Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy LU-3, Policy LU-16, Policy LU-38, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-57, Policy LU-58, Policy LU-60, Policy LU-61, Policy LU-62, Policy LU-63, Policy LU-67	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.1.4 Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable	None Applicable	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, including the Placer Legacy Program. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .				
Impact 4.1.5 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development in western Placer County, could result in cumulative impacts to land use in the region. However, the proposed General Plan Update has mitigating policies and their associated action steps that would reduce its contribution to a less than significant level. The project's contribution to cumulative land use impacts is considered less than cumulatively considerable .	Policy LU-3, Policy LU-6, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-14, Policy LU-15, Policy LU-16, Policy LU-18, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-26, Policy LU-36, Policy LU-37, Policy LU-38, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-46, Policy LU-57, Policy LU-58, Policy LU-59, Policy LU-60, Policy LU-61, Policy LU-62, Policy LU-63, Policy LU-67	LCC	None required	LCC
4.2 Air Quality				
Impact 4.2.1 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in emissions greater than the standards identified by the Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. Such an exceedance could result in a conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, or regulations for air pollutants, and/or conflict or obstruct implementation of any air quality plan. However, General Plan Update growth projections are generally consistent with SACOG projections and would not conflict with the Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable	Policy LU-3, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-23, Policy LU-26, Policy LU-33, Policy LU-35, Policy LU-39, Policy OCR-27, Policy OCR-28, Policy OCR-58, Policy OCR-59, Policy C-2, Policy C-3, Policy C-4, Policy C-5, Policy C-50, Policy C-51, Policy C-52, Policy C-53, Policy C-54, Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58,	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
Further Progress Plan or result in the delayed attainment of air quality standard. In addition, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant .	Policy C-59, Policy C-60			
Impact 4.2.2 Project-related construction and development over the planning horizon of the proposed project including vegetation removal, excavation, grading, paving, operation of vehicles, painting, and other construction activities could increase the potential for air pollutants, which in turn could result in a violation of an air quality standard or in a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation. However, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps, along with City, District, State and Federal Rule Based Requirements discussed below, ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy OCR-58	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.2.3 Negative air quality impacts associated with long-term emissions from projected growth over the planning horizon of the proposed project could result in a violation of an air quality standard or in a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation. Although the proposed General Plan Update has mitigating policies and associated action steps to minimize the effects of this impact, these policies and action steps will not reduce the impact to a less than significant	Policy LU-3, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-23, Policy LU-26, Policy LU-33, Policy LU-35 , Policy LU-39, Policy OCR-27, Policy OCR-28, Policy OCR-56, Policy OCR-58, Policy OCR-59, Policy C-2, Policy C-3, Policy C-4, Policy C-5, Policy C-50, Policy C-51,	S	None feasible beyond the policies, associated action steps, District, State and Federal Rule Based Requirements, and the selection of applicable air quality mitigation measures from a menu list as discussed under Impact 4.2.3, in Section 4.2, Air Quality.	SU

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
level. Therefore, this is considered a potentially significant impact.	Policy C-52, Policy C-53, Policy C-54, Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58, Policy C-59, Policy C-60			
Impact 4.2.4 Implementation of the proposed project would increase traffic volumes that could potentially increase concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) along streets and near intersections. This increase could cause or contribute to local CO concentrations exceeding 20 ppm over a one-hour averaging period or 9 ppm over an eight-hour averaging period. However, air quality modeling and analysis show that increases in CO concentrations resulting from the proposed project will not exceed these thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	None Applicable	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.2.5 Development of the land uses in the proposed General Plan Update could include sources of toxic air contaminants which may impact surrounding land uses, or conversely, place sensitive land uses near existing sources of toxic air contaminants. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	Policy OCR-58, Policy OCR-59	PS	MM 4.2.1 Add the following General Plan policy: "Reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential health risks from toxic air contaminants (TACs)," and add the following associated action steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development projects and projects categorized as sensitive receptors shall be located an adequate distance from existing and potential sources of toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions such as freeways, major arterials, industrial sites, and hazardous material locations. "Adequate distance" will be based on site-specific 	SU

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>conditions, the type and location of sensitive receptors, the types and amounts of potential TAC emissions, mitigation measures which reduce potential health risks from TAC emissions, and other factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City shall require new air pollution point sources (such as, but not limited to, industrial, manufacturing, and processing facilities) to be located an adequate distance from residential areas and other sensitive receptors. "Adequate distance" will be based on site-specific conditions, the type and location of sensitive receptors, the types and amounts of potential Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions, mitigation measures which reduce potential health risks from TAC emissions, and other factors. 	
<p>Impact 4.2.6 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could include sources that could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-58, Policy OCR-59</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Continued implementation of PCAPCD Rule 205 and proposed General Plan Update policies OCR-58 and OCR-59 and their associated action steps would help to reduce the impact of creating objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.2.7 Implementation of the proposed project, along with potential development of the surrounding region, would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. The proposed project's contribution to these conditions is considered cumulatively considerable and a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	<p>Policy LU-3, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-23, Policy LU-26, Policy LU-33, Policy LU-35, Policy LU-39, Policy OCR-27, Policy OCR-28, Policy OCR-58, Policy OCR-59, Policy C-2, Policy C-3, Policy C-4, Policy C-5, Policy C-50, Policy C-51, Policy C-52, Policy C-53, Policy C-54, Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58, Policy C-59, Policy C-60</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies identified under Impact 4.2.3 in Section 4.2, Air Quality, as well as their associated action steps would assist in reducing the proposed project's contribution to cumulative regional and local air quality impacts; however, this contribution is still considered cumulatively considerable and thus a significant and unavoidable impact. No feasible mitigation is available to completely mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>
<p>4.3 Aesthetics/Light and Glare</p>				
<p>Impact 4.3.1 Implementation of the proposed project would result in continued development within the Planning Area. However, no lands within the Planning Area are designated as a scenic vista. Therefore, a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would not occur as a result of project implementation and no impact is identified.</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 4.3.2 Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially damage any scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 4.3.3 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased development which would substantially degrade the existing</p>	<p>Policy LU-8, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-18, Policy LU-19, LU-21, Policy LU-38, Policy</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Aside from the policies listed under Impact 4.3.3 in Section 4.3, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, no other mitigation measures are</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
visual character or quality of the area and its surroundings. Although the proposed General Plan Update has mitigating policies and associated action steps, these policies and associated action steps will not reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.	LU-39, Policy LU-50, Policy LU-51, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-53, Policy LU-54, Policy LU-55, Policy OCR-43		available to fully mitigate impacts to existing visual character given the extent of development and density proposed. While compliance with the City’s Design Review Guidelines, Zoning Ordinance and General Plan policies would ensure visual compatibility with existing development, as well as an evaluation of the preservation of unique natural features, the visual character of the Planning Area would still be altered as further development occurs. Therefore, impacts associated with substantially degrading the existing visual character or quality of the Planning Area and its surroundings are considered significant and unavoidable .	
Impact 4.3.4 Implementation of the proposed project could result in an increase in daytime glare and/or nighttime lighting. This increase in daytime glare sources and nighttime lighting levels could have an adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	Policy LU-4, Policy LU-18, Policy LU-21, Policy LU-38, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-50, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-54	SU	Implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the proposed General Plan Update policies identified under Impact 4.3.4 in Section 4.3, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, would reduce the impacts to daytime glare and nighttime lighting by addressing light and glare issues in more detail in the Design Review Guidelines and through project specific reviews. 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 and cannot be fully mitigated given the extent and density of development under the proposed General	SU

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			Plan Update. Therefore, impacts resulting from creation of new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area are considered significant and unavoidable .	
<p>Impact 4.3.5 While the Planning Area does not contain any scenic vistas or scenic resources within a state scenic highway, implementation of the proposed project would result in alterations to the city's existing visual character through the increased expansion of urban development and creation of additional new sources of light and glare. This is considered a cumulatively considerable impact.</p>	<p>Policy LU-4, Policy LU-8, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-18, Policy LU-19, LU-21, Policy LU-38, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-50, Policy LU-51, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-53, Policy LU-54, Policy LU-55, Policy OCR-43</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>Implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the proposed General Plan Update policies referenced under Impact 4.3.5 in Section 4.3, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, would assist in reducing the city's contribution to visual resources, light and glare impacts. However, the visual character of the city and the region would still be substantially altered and overall light and glare would be increased. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to fully offset the extent of this visual impact given the extent and density of development under the proposed General Plan Update and its associated project components. Therefore, this impact is considered cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>
<p>4.4 Transportation and Circulation</p>				
<p>Impact 4.4.1 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would cause intersection operations to deteriorate to levels below LOS C standard (based on proposed General Plan Update Policy C-10). For intersections already operating below the LOS C standard, the increased traffic could cause intersection operations to deteriorate</p>	<p>Policy C-7, Policy C-8, Policy C-9, Policy C-10, Policy C-20, Policy C-22</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.4.1 The following intersections shall be added to the City's CIP as part of implementation of proposed General Plan Update Policy C-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Pacific Street and Del Mar Avenue/Dominguez Road</u> - Modify the intersection to include a free right turn 	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>by volume-to-capacity ratio increases of at least 0.05. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>			<p>lane from Del Mar Avenue onto Pacific Street to improve intersection operation to LOS C (v/c = 0.711).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Rocklin Road and Sierra College Boulevard</u> - Modify the intersection to include a free eastbound right turn lane from Rocklin Road onto Sierra College Boulevard to improve intersection operation to LOS B (v/c = 0.698). • <u>Sunset Boulevard and Pacific Street</u> - Modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes, a shared left-through lane, and a right turn lane on eastbound Sunset Boulevard to improve intersection operation to LOS C (v/c = 0.751). • <u>Sunset Boulevard and West Oaks Boulevard</u> - Modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes from West Oaks Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard to improve intersection operation to LOS C (v/c = 0.709). • <u>Stanford Ranch Road and Crest Drive</u> - Modify the intersection to include a free westbound right turn lane from Crest Drive onto Stanford Ranch Road to improve intersection operation to LOS C (v/c = 0.776). • <u>Sierra College Boulevard and Dominguez Road</u> - Modify the intersection to include a single 	

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>eastbound through lane on Dominguez Road and a free eastbound right turn lane from Dominguez Road onto southbound Sierra College Boulevard to improve intersection operation to LOS B (v/c = 0.617).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Granite Drive and Rocklin Road</u> – Modify the intersection to include two through lanes plus a combined through/right turn lane in both directions on Rocklin Road, in addition to providing dual eastbound lanes on Rocklin Road to improve intersection operation to LOS C (v/c = 0.762). • <u>Pacific Street and Farron Street</u> – Modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes from northbound Pacific Street to westbound Farron Street and a combined through/left and separate right turn lane on eastbound Farron Street to improve intersection operations to LOS C (v/c = 0.724). This improvement will require that Farron Street be modified to include two receiving lanes on the north side of Farron Street between Pacific Street and the UP railroad tracks. • <u>Pacific Street and Rocklin Road</u> – Modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes and a single through lane on westbound Rocklin Road and a free right turn lane from northbound Pacific 	

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>Street to eastbound Rocklin Road to improve intersection operations to LOS C (v/c = 0.724).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sunset Boulevard and Whitney Boulevard</u> – Modify the intersection to include two left turn lanes from westbound Sunset Boulevard to Whitney Boulevard and a shared left/through and free right turn lane on northbound Whitney Boulevard to improve intersection operations to LOS C (v/c = 0.712). • <u>Sunset Boulevard and Atherton Drive</u> – Modify the intersection to include two eastbound left turn lanes from Sunset Boulevard onto northbound University Avenue, two southbound through lanes on University Avenue, and from northbound Atherton Drive, two left turn lanes onto westbound Sunset Boulevard, a separate northbound through lane on Atherton Drive and a free right turn lane onto eastbound Sunset Boulevard to improve intersection operations to LOS C (v/c = 0.768). • <u>Sunset Boulevard and Park Drive</u> – Modify the intersection to include three northbound left turn lanes from Park Drive onto Sunset Boulevard to improve intersection operations to LOS 	

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>C (v/c = 0.736).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Stanford Ranch Road and Sunset Boulevard – Modify the intersection to include two eastbound left turn lanes from West Stanford Ranch Road to Sunset Boulevard and three westbound through lanes on West Stanford Ranch Road to improve intersection operations to LOS C (v/c = 0.796). 	
<p>Impact 4.4.2 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes on state/interstate highway facilities, which could cause operations at state/interstate highway segments to deteriorate to levels below those identified in the Caltrans Transportation Concept Report (TCR). This impact is considered significant.</p>	<p>Policy C-11, Policy C-12, Policy C-13</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>While the City has policies and traffic impact fees currently in place which are expected to help reduce impacts to highway segments, the City does not have the complete jurisdiction, authority, or capability to fund implementation of improvements to highway segments. Since mitigation of this impact is outside of the City's control, the impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at state/interstate highway intersections at buildout. This impact is considered significant.</p>	<p>Policy C-7, Policy C-8, Policy C-9, Policy C-10, Policy C-11, Policy C-12, Policy C-13, Policy C-20, Policy C-22</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>While the City has policies and traffic impact fees currently in place which are expected to help reduce impacts to highway ramp intersections, the City does not have the complete jurisdiction, authority, or capability to fund implementation of improvements to highway ramp intersections. Since mitigation of this impact is outside of the City's control, the impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at some Loomis intersections, which could result in operations at one or more intersections to deteriorate to levels below LOS C standard, or for intersections that already operate below the LOS standard, the increased traffic could cause intersection operations to deteriorate by an average delay increase of at least 5 seconds. However, traffic modeling and analysis show that increases in traffic resulting from the proposed project would not exceed these thresholds. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy C-11, Policy C-13</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.5 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at some Roseville intersections, which could cause a signalized intersection previously identified in Roseville’s CIP as functioning at LOS C or better to deteriorate to LOS D or worse, or at a signalized intersection previously identified in Roseville’s CIP as functioning as LOS D or E conditions, to deteriorate to the next lowest LOS level. However, traffic modeling and analysis show that increases in traffic caused by the proposed General Plan Update would not exceed these thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy C-11, Policy C-13</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.6 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at some Lincoln intersections, which could cause the operations at one or more</p>	<p>Policy C-11, Policy C-13</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
intersections to deteriorate to levels below a LOS C standard, to deteriorate by one grade or its volume-to-capacity ratio to increase by at least 0.05. However, traffic modeling and analysis show that increases in traffic resulting from the proposed General Plan Update would not exceed these thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .				
Impact 4.4.7 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at Placer County intersections, which would cause roadway or intersection operations to deteriorate to levels below LOS C standard, or LOS D within one-half mile of state highways, or if an intersection already operates below the LOS standard, cause roadway or intersection operations to deteriorate by one grade or its volume-to-capacity ratio to increase by at least 0.05. However, traffic modeling and analysis show that increases in traffic resulting from the proposed General Plan Update would not exceed these thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy C-11, Policy C-13	LS	None required.	LS
Impact 4.4.8 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would result in increased demand for transit services which could cause a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant .	Policy C-50, Policy C-51, Policy C-53, Policy C-54	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.4.9 Implementation of buildout of the proposed project would result in increased demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. However, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and associated action steps ensure the impact would be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58, Policy C-59</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.10 Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in traffic volumes as well as potential increases in pedestrians and bicycle users that could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. This is considered a less than significant impact based on proposed General Plan Update Policy C-33.</p>	<p>Policy C-33</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>4.5 Noise</p>				
<p>Impact 4.5.1 The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies. Although the proposed General Plan Update has mitigating policies and their associated action steps designed to minimize the effects of this impact, these policies and associated action steps will not reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this would be considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy N-1, Policy N-3, Policy N-4, Policy N-5 , Policy N-6</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update noise policies listed under Impact 4.5.1 in Section 4.5, Noise, and their associated action steps would reduce potential noise impacts associated with development and operation of land uses of the proposed General Plan Update. Future development projects would be required to analyze project-related noise impacts and incorporate necessary noise-reduction measures sufficient to achieve the applicable noise standards of the City’s</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>Noise Element. Implementation of these policies and actions will help to reduce impacts associated with proposed development. Noise-reduction measures typically implemented to reduce traffic noise include increased insulation, setbacks, and construction of sound barriers. Some measures, such as construction of sound barriers, may have secondary impacts related to aesthetics and safety. The feasibility of these measures would be determined on a project-by-project basis. However, it may not be possible to fully mitigate noise in excess of City standards in all areas, particularly in existing development that may be constrained due to age, placement, or other factors which limit the feasibility of mitigation (e.g., residences fronting on the roadway that limits the ability to utilize noise barrier). As a result, the proposed General Plan Update could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies, which is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.5.2 Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above</p>	<p>No applicable proposed General Plan policies have been identified that would reduce this impact.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>No further mitigation is required beyond implementation of the General Plan Update's mitigating policies and associated action steps.</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>levels existing conditions and could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies. However, the proposed General Plan Update includes Action Step NA-3 that limits the hours of work. This impact would be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>However, as a part of the General Plan Update process, the City has developed action steps that coincide with General Plan policies and identify ways in which the policy will be applied and implemented. To that end, Action Step NA-3 below identifies the procedure and process by which construction noise levels will be addressed.</p> <p>Action Step NA-3 Limit construction activity to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekends when construction is conducted in proximity to residential or other noise sensitive land uses, unless such restriction would result in increased risk to the health and/or safety of the general public or construction workers, or a determination is made by the City based on substantial evidence that it is in the best interests of the City to approve alternative hours of work.</p>		<p>Although the City's General Plan Noise Element does not identify a short-term construction noise level threshold, the Noise Compatibility Guidelines included in the Noise Element identify acceptable and unacceptable noise levels for different types of land uses. The distinction between short- and long-term noise levels is a typical one in both CEQA documents and local noise ordinances, which generally recognize the reality that short-term noise from construction activities is inevitable and cannot be mitigated beyond a certain level. Thus, local agencies frequently tolerate short-term noise at levels that they would not accept for permanent noise sources. A more severe approach would be impractical and might preclude the kind of construction activities that are inevitable from time to time in urban environments. Most residents of urban areas recognize this reality and expect to hear noise from construction activities on occasion. Noise from construction activities is considered to be temporary in the sense that once the construction activities cease, so too will the noise from the construction activities. Noise from construction activities is also considered to be intermittent due to the type, location, and duration of construction equipment being used. In recognition of noise caused by construction activities, projects in the city must comply with the</p>	

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>City’s Construction Noise Guidelines, which are embodied in Action Step NA-3 noted above; such compliance includes limitations on the hours of construction.</p> <p>Due to the short-term nature of construction noise, the intermittent frequency of construction noise, and the required compliance with the City’s Construction Noise Guidelines, which are referenced in Action Step NA-3, including compliance with hours of construction, construction noise level increases will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies. The impact of new construction noise is reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan Update Action Step NA-3.</p> <p>In addition, as discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and under Impact 4.5.1 above, the project includes the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan and the CAP, both of which would be consistent with the proposed General Plan Update and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this</p>	

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			DEIR. As these project components would not result in land use activities or population growth beyond what is identified in the General Plan Update, they would not result in construction noise impacts beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be less than significant .	
<p>Impact 4.5.3 The proposed project could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies, as a result of increased traffic on the roadway network. Projected increases in traffic noise levels could adversely affect noise-sensitive land uses. In addition, future development of noise-sensitive land uses could be exposed to roadway and/or railroad noise levels in excess of the City's noise standards. This impact would be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy N-1, Policy N-2, Policy N-7, Policy N-8, Policy N-9</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update noise policies identified under Impact 4.5.3 in Section 4.5, Noise, would reduce potential transportation noise impacts. Future development projects would be required to analyze project-related noise impacts and incorporate necessary noise-reduction measures sufficient to achieve the applicable noise standards of the City's Noise Element. Implementation of these policies and actions will help to reduce impacts associated with proposed development. Noise-reduction measures typically implemented to reduce traffic noise include increased insulation, setbacks, and construction of sound barriers. Some measures, such as construction of sound barriers, may have secondary impacts related to aesthetics and safety. The feasibility of these measures would be determined on a project-by-project basis. However, it may not be possible to fully mitigate traffic and/or railroad noise in all</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>areas, particularly in existing development that may be constrained due to age, placement, or other factors which limit the feasibility of mitigation (e.g., residences fronting on the roadway that limits the ability to utilize noise barrier). As a result, increases in transportation noise associated with the proposed General Plan Update would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and would result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies, which is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.5.4 Subsequent development associated with the proposed project could result in new noise-sensitive land uses encroaching upon existing or proposed stationary noise sources or new stationary noise sources encroaching upon existing or proposed noise-sensitive land uses. This could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels or could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Policy N-1, Policy N-2, Policy N-3, Policy N-4, Policy N-5, Policy N-6</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>No additional mitigation (beyond application of City policies listed under 4.5.4 in Section 4.5, Noise) is feasible.</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.5.5 The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration levels. However, the proposed General Plan Update includes Action Step NA-3 that limits the hours of work for construction. This impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No applicable proposed General Plan policies have been identified that would reduce this impact. However, as a part of the General Plan Update process, the City has developed action steps that coincide with General Plan policies and identify ways in which the policy will be applied and implemented. To that end, Action Step NA-3 below identifies the procedure and process by which construction noise levels will be addressed.</p> <p>Action Step NA-3 – Limit construction activity to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekends when construction is conducted in proximity to residential or other noise sensitive land uses, unless such restriction would result in increased risk to the health and/or safety of the general public or construction workers, or a determination is made by the City based on</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>Due to the short-term nature of construction vibrations, the intermittent frequency of construction vibrations, and the required compliance with the City’s Construction Noise Guidelines which are referenced in Action Step NA-3, including compliance with hours of construction, construction vibration level increases will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration. By restricting the hours of construction to avoid vibrations during times when it could potentially be more of a nuisance, the impact of new construction vibration is reduced to a less than significant level through the application of the General Plan Update Action Step NA-3. In addition, individual development projects will be subject to site-specific environmental review, which will necessitate identification of site-specific mitigation in the event that significant impacts are identified.</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
	substantial evidence that it is in the best interests of the City to approve alternative hours of work.			
<p>Impact 4.5.6 Buildout of the proposed project would increase transportation noise along roadways within the Planning Area. This would be a cumulatively considerable impact.</p>	<p>Policy N-1, Policy N-2, Policy N-7, Policy N-8, Policy N-9</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update noise policies identified under Impact 4.5.3 in Section 4.5, Noise, would reduce potential transportation noise impacts in the city. Future development projects would be required to analyze project-related noise impacts and incorporate necessary noise-reduction measures sufficient to achieve applicable noise standards. Implementation of these policies and actions will help to reduce impacts associated with proposed development. Noise-reduction measures typically implemented to reduce transportation noise include increased insulation and building requirements, setbacks, and construction of sound barriers. Some measures, such as construction of sound barriers, may have secondary impacts related to aesthetics and safety. The feasibility of these measures (such as adequate right-of way, cost of the mitigation) would be determined on a project-by-project basis. While General Plan Update noise policies and noise reduction measures would reduce noise levels whenever feasible, there may be some cases when transportation noise</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			impacts cannot be fully mitigated. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in transportation noise impacts which are cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable .	
<p>Impact 4.5.7 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other development in western Placer County, would increase transportation noise along area roadways adjacent to the City. However, the increases in noise levels would be less than 3 dBA and not be noticeable. Therefore, substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project are considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy N-1, Policy N-2, Policy N-7, Policy N-8, Policy N-9</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>
<p>4.6 Geology and Soils</p>				
<p>Impact 4.6.1 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project may result in the placement of structures and development in areas of seismic sensitivity which would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to seismic hazards. However, current CBC requirements and the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy S-1, Policy S-20, Policy S-21</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.6.2 Implementation of the proposed project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as a result of construction and site preparation activities. However, existing City development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered to be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-49, Policy OCR-50, Policy OCR-51</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.3 Implementation of the proposed project may allow for development 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 landslides, lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse. Development may be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life and property. However, current City standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy S-1, Policy S-20, Policy S-21 and through compliance with the City’s Building Code as well as implementation of measures from geotechnical analyses.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.4 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project may allow for development in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater or where soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. However, compliance with Placer County Environmental Health Services Department’s requirements for the</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
approval and installation of septic systems would ensure that impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems within the Planning Area are mitigated to less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.				
Impact 4.6.5 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the City of Rocklin and adjacent areas, may result in the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to cumulative seismic hazards. However, current CBC requirements and the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than cumulatively considerable impact.	Policy S-1, Policy S-20, Policy S-21	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.6.6 Implementation of the proposed project may result in substantial construction and site preparation activities, which could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, existing development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered to be a less than cumulatively considerable impact.	Policy OCR-49, Policy OCR-50, Policy OCR-51	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
4.7 Human Health/Hazards				
<p>Impact 4.7.1 Implementation of the proposed project could expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires associated with residential development in the wildland-urban interface. However, existing development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered to be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy S-2, Policy S-3, Policy S-4, Policy S-5, Policy S-16, Policy S-17, Policy S-18, Policy S-19</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.7.2 Implementation of the proposed project could result in safety hazards associated with operations at public airports and private airstrips adjacent to areas proposed for development. The Rocklin Planning Area is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airport or airstrip. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.7.3 Development permitted under the proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through the reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Further, development under the proposed project could also lead to the handling or emission of</p>	<p>Policy OCR-59, Policy S-13, Policy S-14, Policy S-15, Policy S-22, Policy S-23,</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, and development under the proposed General Plan Update could occur on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment. However, current local, state, and federal standards and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.7.4 Implementation of the proposed project could impair implementation of or physically interfere with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans in the Planning Area. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy S-2, Policy S-3, Policy S-4, Policy S-5, Policy S-6</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.7.5 Potential development under the proposed project could result in cumulative hazardous materials and human health risk impacts. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy S-2, Policy S-3, Policy S-4, Policy S-5, Policy S-6, Policy S-13, Policy S-14, Policy S-15, Policy S-16, Policy S-17, Policy S-18, Policy S-19, Policy S-22, Policy S-23, Policy OCR-59, along with current federal, state, and</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
	local regulations regarding hazardous materials would address hazards, including wildland fires, and emergency access and operation.			
4.8 Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
Impact 4.8.1 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could potentially cause a direct substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological or historical resource or structure. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy LU-38, Policy LU-41, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-54, Policy OCR-62, Policy OCR-63, Policy OCR-64, OCR-65	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.8.2 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources such as prehistoric archaeological sites, historical archaeological sites, and isolated artifacts and features. Human remains could also be impacted. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.	Policy OCR-65	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.8.3 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could result in the direct or indirect destruction of unique paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations) within the Planning Area. However, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-65</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.8.4 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources, including human remains, in the region. However, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy LU-38, Policy LU-41, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-54, Policy OCR-62, Policy OCR-63, Policy OCR-64, Policy OCR-65</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>
<p>Impact 4.8.5 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to historic character in the region. The proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating goals and policies and their associated action steps would reduce the severity of impacts to historic character. However, the policies would not completely mitigate this impact. Therefore, this impact is considered cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy LU-38, Policy LU-41, Policy LU-52, Policy LU-54, Policy OCR-62, Policy OCR-63, Policy OCR-64, Policy OCR-65</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies LU-38, LU-41, LU-52, LU-54, OCR-62, OCR-63 and OCR-64 would serve to off-set the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative impacts to historic resources. However, because total preservation of historic resources and their context cannot be ensured, impacts to historic character are considered cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.8.6 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources, including unique geological features, in the region. However, the proposed General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	Policy OCR-65	LCC	None required	LCC
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality				
<p>Impact 4.9.1 Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern, 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 or may result in a violation of a water quality standard or waste discharge requirement. However, existing development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-49, Policy OCR-50, Policy OCR-51, Policy OCR-52, Policy OCR-54	LS	None required	LS
<p>Impact 4.9.2 Implementation of the proposed project could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from development within the Planning Area. However, existing development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps</p>	Policy OCR-11, Policy OCR-39 , Policy OCR-49, Policy OCR-50, Policy OCR-51, Policy OCR-52, Policy OCR-54	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .				
Impact 4.9.3 Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in a depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level underlying the City of Rocklin Planning Area. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy OCR-11	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.9.4 Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial alteration of an existing drainage pattern, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, which may substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or could result in the creation or contribution of runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage system. However, City and PCFCWCD development standards and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .	Policy S-10, Policy S-11, Policy S-12 , Policy OCR-48	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.9.5 Implementation of the proposed project may result in the placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map, and may impede or redirect flood flows or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam. However, existing development standards in the Municipal Code and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy S-7, Policy S-8, Policy S-9, Policy S-10, Policy S-11, Policy OCR-11, Policy OCR-46, Policy OCR-47</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.9.6 Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to be impacted from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy S-1, Policy S-21</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.9.7 Land uses and growth under the proposed project, in combination with current land uses in the surrounding region, could introduce substantial grading, site preparation, and an increase in urbanized development. However, existing development standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be</p>	<p>Policy OCR-11, Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-49, Policy OCR-50, Policy OCR-51, Policy OCR-52, Policy OCR-54</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
less than significant. Therefore, cumulative water quality impacts are considered to be less than cumulatively considerable .				
Impact 4.9.8 Implementation of the proposed project could increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions in the Planning Area, which could contribute to cumulative flood conditions downstream. However, existing City and PCFCWCD development standards and the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than cumulatively considerable impact.	Policy S-10, Policy S-11, Policy S-12, Policy OCR-48	LCC	None required	LCC
4.10 Biological Resources				
Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by CDFG and USFWS. Further, implementation of the proposed project could reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened plant or animal species or biotic community, thereby causing the species or community to drop below self-sustaining levels. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-40, Policy OCR-41	PS	MM 4.10.1 The following shall be added as action steps to the General Plan Update Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element. <ul style="list-style-type: none">To offset possible losses of sensitive native wildlife and plant habitat (e.g., wetland habitat, riparian habitat, and oak woodlands) due to development projects, developers shall be responsible for mitigation. Such mitigation measures may include providing and permanently maintaining similar quality and quantity of replacement habitat, enhancing existing habitat areas, or paying fees towards an approved habitat mitigation bank.	LS

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
			<p>Replacement habitat may occur either on-site or at approved off-site locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For those areas in which special-status species are found or are likely to occur, the City shall require feasible mitigation of impacts to those species that ensure that the activity does not contribute to the decline of the affected species such that their decline would impact the viability of the species. Mitigation shall be determined by the City after the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) are provided an opportunity to comment. 	
<p>Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by CDFG and USFWS. Further, implementation of the proposed project could reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened plant or animal species or biotic community, thereby causing the species or community to drop below self-sustaining levels. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-40, Policy OCR-41</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implementation of the policies listed under Impact 4.10.1, their associated action steps and mitigation measure MM 4.10.1 in Section 4.10, Biological Resources, would ensure that impacts to special-status species are mitigated by requiring replacement of habitat lost as well as maintenance of special-status species viability. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFG or USFWS due to disturbance, degradation, and removal of sensitive biological communities. Implementation of the proposed project could also 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) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-40, Policy OCR-41</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>While implementation of the above policies, their associated action steps and mitigation measure MM4.10.1 would likely mitigate the loss of sensitive habitat areas in the city, complete offset of the habitat loss cannot be ensured in every circumstance. The City specifically notes that balancing the needs of the city will result in some modification of existing open space and natural resources (see Policy OCR-2). Significant and unavoidable loss of sensitive habitat areas and resources from planned growth of the city has already been identified in the 1990 City of Rocklin General Plan EIR. Thus, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>Impact 4.10.4 Implementation of the proposed project could interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. However, remaining development under the proposed project would not substantially convert major remaining undisturbed open space and riparian areas that could serve as migratory corridors, and the proposed General Plan Update Land Use Diagram provides several movement corridors designated as open space along waterways in the City that connect with land areas outside of Rocklin. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.10.5 Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance as a result of the removal of native oak trees, including heritage trees and other mature, healthy oak trees. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and the associated tree removal could also 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 CDFG and USFWS. This impact can be partially mitigated through the preservation of trees proposed for removal, the relocation or replanting of removed trees and contributions to the City's Oak Tree Preservation Fund, but would be significant and unavoidable because the removed trees would not be immediately replaced with mature oak trees.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-41, Policy OCR-43</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>While application of the policy provisions listed under Impact 4.10.5 in Section 4.10, Biological Resources, would assist in mitigating potential impacts resulting from project implementation and the associated removal of native oak trees, the loss of a substantial number of mature, healthy oak trees, including some heritage trees, would still result. Despite the implementation of the policy provisions and procedures noted above, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable because the removed trees would not be immediately replaced with mature oak trees.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>Impact 4.10.6 Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance as a result of the removal of areas of oak woodland habitat. Implementation of the proposed project and the associated oak woodland habitat removal could also 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 CDFG or USFWS. This impact</p>	<p>Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-41, Policy OCR-43</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>While implementation of the above policy provisions would assist in mitigating potential impacts resulting from the loss of oak woodlands, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable because the mitigation strategy, in part, allows for the replanting of trees (either directly or through payments to the City) that will take many years to become as mature as many of the oak trees that will be removed.</p>	<p>SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>can be partially mitigated through the preservation, creation and restoration of the City's urban forest and oak woodlands that would take place over time as part of the City's mitigation strategy, but would be significant and unavoidable because the mitigation strategy allows for the replanting of trees (either directly or through payments to the City) that will take many years to become as mature as many of the oak trees that will be removed, and the mitigation strategy may not necessarily result in the re-creation of areas of oak woodland habitat.</p>			<p>With the implementation of the above policy provisions and associated action items and mitigation measures, the mature, healthy oak trees removed to facilitate development on a project site will be replanted, relocated, and or replaced over time, but not necessarily as a part of an overall oak woodland habitat area. The City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance allows for dedication of land as a means for mitigating oak tree removal, which would potentially allow for the preservation of some oak woodland habitat areas. However, it has been the City's experience that this mitigation option is rarely used. While some areas of oak woodland habitat in the City have been retained and it is anticipated that additional development under the General Plan will also result in the retention of some areas of oak woodland habitat, it is recognized that continued development in the City will still result in the loss of areas of oak woodland habitat. For these reasons, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.10.7 The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans,</p>	<p>Policy OCR-5, Policy OCR-39, Policy OCR-40, Policy OCR-41, Policy OCR-43</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>Implementation of the policies listed under Impacts 4.10.1, 4.10.3, and 4.10.5, their associated action steps and mitigation measure MM 4.10.1 in Section 4.10, Biological Resources, would ensure that impacts to special-status species are</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>policies or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS. The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, could also have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects could also 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) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, could also 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. Further, the proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, could reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened plant or animal species or biotic community, thereby causing the species or community to drop below self-sustaining levels. Therefore, this impact is considered cumulatively considerable.</p>			<p>mitigated by requiring replacement of habitat lost as well as maintenance of special-status species viability. However, complete offset of the habitat loss in the city cannot be ensured in every circumstance. The City specifically notes that balancing the needs of the city may result in some modification of existing open space and natural resources (see Policy OCR-2). Significant and unavoidable loss of sensitive habitat areas and resources from planned growth of the city has already been identified in the 1990 City of Rocklin General Plan EIR. Thus, the city's contribution to the loss of sensitive habitat is considered cumulatively considerable and a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
4.11 Population and Housing				
<p>Impact 4.11.1 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could induce substantial growth or concentration of population in an area either directly or indirectly that results in a physical effect on the environment. However, implementation of the proposed project and the associated General Plan Update land use designations would not contribute to the significant generation of growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact</p>	None Applicable	LS	None required	LS
<p>Impact 4.11.2 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in the displacement of housing and/or persons, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. However, the proposed General Plan Update has been developed to avoid displacing a substantial number of housing units or people. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	None Applicable	LS	None required	LS
<p>Impact 4.11.3 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development, could result in a cumulative increase in population and housing growth in the City of Rocklin as well as in the surrounding communities of Roseville, Lincoln, unincorporated Placer County and Loomis. However, the implementation of the proposed</p>	None Applicable	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
project would not result in an increase in population or housing growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections. Therefore, this is a less than cumulatively considerable impact.				
4.12 Public Services				
Impact 4.12.1.1 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services within the Planning Area. For the City to meet the increased demand and in order to maintain acceptable response times or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency services, it may be necessary to provide or construct new or physically altered fire related facilities or services, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-4, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-9, Policy PF-11, Policy PF-12, Policy PF-13, Policy PF-20, Policy PF-21, Policy PF-22 , Policy PF-23, Policy PF-25, Policy S-16, Policy S-17, Policy S-18, Policy S-19	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.12.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased development within the Planning Area and a need for water supply and infrastructure to provide adequate fire flows for fire protection. The creation of new or expansion of existing water supply infrastructure necessary to maintain acceptable response times or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency services could create substantial adverse physical impacts, which could cause significant	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-11, Policy PF-25, Policy S-16	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
environmental impacts. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.				
Impact 4.12.1.3 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development within the RFD and AMR service areas, would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services and thus require additional staffing, equipment, and related facilities under cumulative conditions. Provision of these related facilities could cause substantial adverse physical impacts, which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable .	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-4, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-9, Policy PF-11, Policy PF-12, Policy PF-13, Policy PF-20, Policy PF-21, Policy PF-22, Policy PF-23, Policy PF-25, Policy S-16, Policy S-17, Policy S-18, Policy S-19	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.12.2.1 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased demand for law enforcement services within the Planning Area. For the City to meet the increased demand and in order to maintain acceptable response times or other performance objectives for law enforcement services, it may be necessary to provide or construct new or physically altered government facilities, the construction and/or provision of which could create substantial adverse physical impacts which could	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-4, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-9, Policy PF-11, Policy PF-12, Policy PF-13, Policy PF-16	LS	None required	LS

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.12.2.2 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development within the RPD service area, would increase the demand for law enforcement services and thus require additional staffing, equipment, and related facilities under cumulative conditions. Provision of these related facilities could cause substantial adverse physical impacts, which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-4, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-9, Policy PF-11, Policy PF-12, Policy PF-13, Policy PF-16</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>
<p>Impact 4.12.3.1 Implementation of the proposed project would increase population in the Planning Area, which would subsequently increase student enrollment in RUSD's and other district's schools. It may be necessary to construct new or expanded school facilities to serve the increased demand. Construction or expansion of school facilities could result in substantial adverse physical impacts, which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated</p>	<p>Policy PF-26, Policy PF-27, Policy PF-28</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
action steps, as well as state law required mitigation through the payment of development impact fees, ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.				
Impact 4.12.3.2 Implementation of the proposed project would increase population in the Planning Area, which could increase demand for post-secondary education facilities provided by the Sierra Community College District. It may be necessary to construct new or expanded post-secondary education facilities to serve the increased demand. Construction or expansion of post-secondary school facilities could result in substantial adverse physical impacts, which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps, as well as state law regarding siting of school facilities ensure that impacts associated with provision of school facilities will be mitigated. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact .	Policy PF-26, Policy PF-28	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.12.3.3 Population growth associated with implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in the cumulative setting, would result in a cumulative increase in student enrollment and require additional school-related facilities to accommodate the growth. The construction of new or expanded school facilities could result in substantial adverse physical impacts, which could	Policy PF-26, Policy PF-27, Policy PF-28	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>cause significant environmental impacts. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps, as well as state law required mitigation through payment of development impact fees, ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is a less than cumulatively considerable impact.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.12.4.1 Implementation of the proposed project could increase population in the Planning Area, which could subsequently increase the use of existing park and recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur and/or require the construction or expansion of park and recreational facilities to meet increased demand which could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered to be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-12, Policy OCR-13, Policy OCR-18, Policy OCR-19, Policy OCR-23, Policy OCR-25, Policy OCR-27, Policy OCR-28, Policy OCR-31, Policy OCR-33, Policy OCR-35, Policy OCR-36, Policy OCR-38</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementation of the proposed project could increase population in the Planning Area, which could subsequently increase the use of existing park and recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur and/or require the construction or expansion of park and recreational facilities to meet increased demand which could have an adverse physical cumulative effect on the environment. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated</p>	<p>Policy OCR-12, Policy OCR-13, Policy OCR-18, Policy OCR-19, Policy OCR-23, Policy OCR-25, Policy OCR-27, Policy OCR-28, Policy OCR-31, Policy OCR-33, Policy OCR-35, Policy OCR-36, Policy OCR-38</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. This would be a less than cumulatively considerable impact.	OCR-36, Policy OCR-38			
4.13 Utilities and Service Systems				
Impact 4.13.1.1 Implementation of the proposed project would increase wastewater flows and could require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities to accommodate anticipated demand. This construction or expansion could cause significant environmental effects. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant .	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.13.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project would increase wastewater flows and could require construction of additional collection infrastructure to accommodate anticipated demand. The construction of this infrastructure could result in a physical effect on the environment. These impacts are considered potentially significant .	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.13.1.3 Implementation of the proposed project, along with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development within SPMUD and SPWA service areas, would result in increased demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment. In order to meet the increased demand, construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
facilities may be necessary. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies, and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to this impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable .				
Impact 4.13.2.1 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased demand for solid waste services within the Planning Area. A substantial environmental impact could occur if there is insufficient capacity in available landfills for disposal of solid waste to meet the increased demand. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-29	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.13.2.2 Implementation of the proposed project, along with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development within the WPWMA service area, would result in increased demand for solid waste services. A substantial environmental impact could occur if there is insufficient capacity in available landfills for disposal of solid waste to meet the increased demand. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update’s mitigating policies and associated action steps will ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is less than cumulatively considerable .	Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-29	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>Impact 4.13.3.1 Implementation of the proposed project would require additional electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services, which could result in the need for new systems of supplies or a substantial expansion or alteration to electrical, natural gas, or telecommunications systems that result in a physical impact on the environment or would result in inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps, and the requirement that subsequent development under the General Plan comply with energy efficiency standards in Title 24 of the California Code, ensure that the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered to be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy PF-33, Policy PF-35, Policy PF-37, Policy PF-38, Policy PF-39, Policy PF-40, OCR-8, OCR-56</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.13.3.2 Development that would occur in association with the proposed project would be required to meet California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). As a result, the proposed project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-56, Policy OCR-57</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.13.3.3 Implementation of the proposed project, along with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development, would contribute to the cumulative demand for electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services which could result in the need for new systems of supplies or a substantial expansion or alteration to electrical,</p>	<p>Policy PF-33, Policy PF-35, Policy PF-37, Policy PF-38, Policy PF-39, Policy PF-40, Policy OCR-8, Policy OCR-56</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>natural gas, or telecommunications systems that result in a physical impact on the environment or would result in inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps, and the requirement that subsequent development under the General Plan comply with energy efficiency standards in Title 24 of the California Code, ensure that the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than cumulatively considerable impact.</p>				
4.14 Water Resources				
<p>Impact 4.14.1 Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for water supply which could result in the need for new entitlements of a substantial expansion or alteration to local or regional water supplies, especially increased use of surface water supplies and increased groundwater production, that would result in a physical impact to the environment. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps as well as PCWA's efforts to provide adequate and reliable water supply for buildout of its planning area, ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policy OCR-60, Policy OCR-61, Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-41</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impacts 4.14.2 Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for water services that could result in the need for new systems or a substantial expansion or alteration to</p>	<p>Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LS</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
the local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities that would result in a physical impact to the environment. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps would ensure that new development under the proposed project would not proceed without verification and determination that adequate water supply infrastructure exists to serve the development. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant .				
Impact 4.14.3 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development within the PCWA service area, would increase the cumulative demand for water supplies and related infrastructure. This in turn could result in the need for new entitlements or a substantial expansion or alteration to the local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities that would result in a physical impact to the environment. However, the proposed Rocklin General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps, as well as PCWA's efforts to provide adequate and reliable water supply for buildout of its planning area, ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative water supply impacts is considered less than cumulatively considerable .	Policy OCR-60, Policy OCR-61, Policy PF-1, Policy PF-2, Policy PF-3, Policy PF-5, Policy PF-41	LCC	None required	LCC
4.15 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases				
Impact 4.15.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and the Climate Action Plan	Policy LU-3, Policy LU-11, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-25,	LCC	None required	LCC

S – Significant CC - Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI - No Impact
 PS - Potentially Significant LCC - Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM - Significant but Mitigatable

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Applicable General Plan Update Policies	Level of Significance Without Mitigation (After Application of Policies)	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance (After Mitigation)
<p>would implement a number of policies and activities as well as continue the implementation of existing City programs that would complement and be consistent with the early emission reduction strategies contained in the AB 32 Scoping Plan Report to the Governor and Executive Order S-3-05 as well as the recommendations from OPR. Therefore, a conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases is not anticipated. This impact is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>Policy LU-31, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-43, Policy LU-56, Policy C-2, Policy C-3, Policy C-4, Policy C-5, Policy C-6, Policy C-50, Policy C-51, Policy C-53, Policy C-54, Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58, Policy C-59, Policy C-60</p>			
<p>Impact 4.15.2 Future development under the proposed General Plan Update could be exposed to environmental effects associated with climate change. This impact is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable impact.</p>	<p>None Applicable</p>	<p>LCC</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>LCC</p>
<p>Impact 4.15.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and the associated future development would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. This impact is considered to be a cumulatively considerable impact.</p>	<p>Policy LU-3, Policy LU-11, Policy LU-13, Policy LU-25, Policy LU-31, Policy LU-39, Policy LU-43, Policy LU-56, Policy C-2, Policy C-3, Policy C-4, Policy C-5, Policy C-6, Policy C-50, Policy C-51, Policy C-53, Policy C-54, Policy C-55, Policy C-56, Policy C-57, Policy C-58, Policy C-59, Policy C-60</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>	<p>None available to offset increases in emissions.</p>	<p>CC, SU</p>

S – Significant CC- Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI No Impact
 PS-Potentially Significant LCC -Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant SM- Significant but Mitigatable