



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF ROCKLIN**

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

ATTACHMENT 1

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility
DR2023-0014 and ENV2023-0016**

**Northwest of the intersection of West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat
Boulevard, south of Margaret Azevedo Park,
in the City of Rocklin
APNs 378-010-015, 378-010-014, 378-010-013**

June 26, 2024

PREPARED BY:

Bennett Smithhart, Senior Planner, (916) 625-5163

CONTACT INFORMATION:

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

APPLICANT/OWNER:

**The property owner is Chapa-De Indian Health Program Inc. The Applicant is Jack Williams
with JAX Construction**

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

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

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

B. Document Format

This Initial Study is organized into five sections as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

C. CEQA Process

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

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

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

SECTION 2. INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY AND DETERMINATION

A. Summary Information

Project Title:

Chapa De Indian Health South Placer Facility

Lead Agency Name and Address:

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

Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Mohlenbrok, Environmental Coordinator/Community Development Director, 916-625-5162

Project Location:

The project site is located northwest of the intersection of West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard and south of Margaret Azevedo Park, in the City of Rocklin. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers in the project site include 378-010-015, 378-010-014, and 378-010-013.

Project Sponsor's Name:

The property owner is Chapa-De Indian Health Program Inc. and the applicant is Jack Williams with JAX Construction.

Current General Plan Designation: Business Professional / Commercial / Light Industrial

Proposed General Plan Designation: No change requested

Current Zoning: PD-BP/C/LI (Planned Development Business Professional / Commercial / Light Industrial

Proposed Zoning: No change requested

Description of the Project:

Chapa-De Indian Health proposes to construct and operate an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center built out over two or more phases to provide medical, dental, optometry services, related administrative functions, and pharmaceutical services on undeveloped land in the northwestern area of the City of Rocklin just below the Whitney Ranch neighborhood. The first phase includes approximately 62,193 square feet of medical, dental, and behavioral uses, and it is anticipated that the future phases will include two medical/office buildings, approximately 15,000 and 20,000 square feet in size and adjacent associated parking and landscaping on the western portion of the property.

The first phase will include the uses and services described above. The future phases are anticipated to include similar administrative space and medical office uses and services as those in the first phase, but the space devoted to those uses and services within the future phases will be determined upon the operations of the first phase and the resultant future demands. Although the space configuration of the future phases has not yet been determined, the size and location of the two medical/office buildings in the future phases is not anticipated to vary significantly from the project's current site plan. Building elevations for the two medical/office buildings in the future phases have been submitted to the City and are part of the project's Design Review entitlement and this CEQA analysis. At the time that the project applicant wishes to move forward with the future phases, the City will evaluate the project to determine if it is compliant with the Design Review entitlement and whether additional review would be necessary under CEQA.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is located to the north of West Stanford Ranch Road, west of Wildcat Boulevard, east of Sunset Boulevard and the Oracle facility. To the north of the project site is the existing park and open space area of Margaret Azevedo Park. To the east of the project site are a Taco Bell, a daycare center, and City of Rocklin Fire Station 25, across Wildcat Boulevard from the project site. To the south of the project site is the Villas at Stanford Ranch retirement community and a neighborhood of single family homes, located on the other side of West Stanford Ranch Road.

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

- Rocklin Engineering Division approval of Improvement Plans
- Rocklin Building Inspections Division issuance of Building Permits
- Placer County Water Agency approval of construction of water facilities
- South Placer Municipal Utility District approval of construction of sewer facilities
- Placer County Air Pollution Control District approval of dust control plan
- Regional Water Quality Control Board approval of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

C. Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study:

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



David Mohlenbrok
Community Development Department Director

June 26, 2024

Date

SECTION 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Chapa-De Indian Health proposes to construct and operate an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center built out over two or more phases to provide medical, dental, optometry services, related administrative functions, and pharmaceutical services on undeveloped land in the northwestern area of the City of Rocklin. The first phase includes approximately 62,193 square feet of medical, dental, and behavioral uses, and the later phases include approximately 35,000 square feet of additional pharmacy and optometry services.


A. Project Background

Chapa-De Indian Health has been serving Placer County for nearly 50 years. Its original facility was established in Auburn in 1974, providing care to American Indians and their family members. Currently, Chapa-De provides services to over 20,000 active patients at its community health centers in Auburn and Grass Valley.

Current demand outpaces the ability to add staff and providers to existing facilities, which are at their limits for available land and parking. Additionally, over 9,000 of the existing patients reside in South Placer and Sacramento Counties. Of these patients, 2,121 (23%) are traveling from Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Sheridan to access care in Auburn. An additional 2,324 Chapa-De patients (who are predominately American Indian) travel from Sacramento County. Adding a new Rocklin location will provide a more convenient care option for these consumers. Transitioning these patients to a new, more convenient clinic in Rocklin will also alleviate the excessive demand on Chapa-De's Auburn health center, opening more opportunities for Auburn area residents to access care in their own community.

B. Project Location

The project site is located in Rocklin, California, within Placer County. Rocklin is located approximately 22 miles northeast of the City of Sacramento and is bordered by the cities of Granite Bay to the southeast, Roseville to the southwest, Loomis to the northeast, and Lincoln to the north, as shown in **Figure 1**. The City of Rocklin is bisected by a number of major freeways including Interstate 80 (I-80), which provides an east-west connection between San Francisco and Reno; and California State Route (SR) 65, which provides a north-south connection throughout the Central Valley.



SOURCE: ESRI, 2023; ESA, 2023

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 1
Regional Location

The project site has a General Plan designation of Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI) and is zoned as Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI). The site is generally bounded by West Stanford Ranch Road as well as single- and multi-family residential units to the south, Margaret Azevedo Park to the north, Wildcat Boulevard bordering the City of Rocklin Fire Station 25 to the east, and undeveloped land to be developed in the future as well as business offices to the west (see **Figure 2**).

The proposed project would be developed on an approximately 13.1-acre undeveloped lot (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 378-010-015, 378-010-014, and 378-010-013), as shown in **Figure 3**. Future phasing includes the construction of two additional medical/office buildings (15,000 square feet and 20,000 square feet) that are anticipated to include similar uses as those in the first phase, with the addition of more core service providers, as well as in-house pharmacy and optometry services.

Vehicular access to the project site is provided via an access road off of Wildcat Boulevard on the northeast corner of the project site. All-weather drivable access to and over proposed project facilities is required and would not be obstructed by permanent structures, fencing, landscaping, parking, or other limiting improvements.

C. Project Description

Proposed Structures

The proposed project would include an approximately 97,000-square foot medical office, dental clinic, and optometry facility in three separate buildings that would be constructed across two or more phases, as shown in **Figure 4**. The proposed first phase buildings would be a two-story structure that would be visible as a single-story structure from the West Stanford Ranch Road right of way and the two additional structures that would be constructed in a future phase would be single-story structures.

Access and Circulation

The primary vehicle access to the project site would be a driveway on Wildcat Boulevard on the northeast corner of the site and two right-in-right-out driveways along West Stanford Ranch Road.

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the project site would be provided via sidewalks and bicycle lanes along Wildcat Boulevard as well as West Stanford Ranch Road.



Path: U:\GIS\GISProjects\2023\001\202300061 - Chapa de Indian Health Center\03 - Project\VT - Screening\VT - Screening.aprx Fig 2 - Vicinity. F:\Marquez_12/5/2023

SOURCE: ESRI, 2023; ESA, 2023

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 2
Project Vicinity




Path: U:\GIS\GISProjects\2023\001\202300061 - Chapa de Indian Health Center\03 - Project\VT - Screening\aprx Fig 3 - Project Site - FMarquez 12/5/2023

SOURCE: ESRI, 2023; ESA, 2023

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 3
Project Site



SOURCE: Dreyfuss+Blackford, 2024

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 4
Proposed Project Site Plan

Landscaping

A wide variety of trees, shrubs, and groundcover will be implemented throughout the project site, including in the street perimeter, building, and parking areas. See **Figure 5 - Proposed Project Landscape Plan**.

Utilities

The site will be served by domestic water and sewer from operational mains extended and connected to the City of Rocklin system, with sewer service being provided by the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD), and water service being provided by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). Existing sanitary sewer facilities are located along the northern border of the project site adjacent to Margaret Azevedo Park, and along the access road on Wildcat Boulevard.

The SPMUD's local sanitary sewer collection system and PCWA's water service systems will provide the necessary respective utility connections to the project.

The proposed project would include on- and off-site water and sewer service facilities that would include connections to the surrounding infrastructure. Access to existing facilities would be maintained at all times, and all new public sewer facilities would require a minimum 20-foot sewer easement.


As noted above, water service would be provided to the project site by Placer County Water Agency. Electrical service and natural gas to the project site would be provided via service connection to the existing Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) network.

Site Preparation and Construction

Project construction for the first phase will be anticipated to begin in August of 2024 and occur until February of 2026. Construction will include site preparation, grading, building construction, and paving. Construction activity would occur five days per week, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. See **Table 1**, Construction Schedule, for the timing of each construction phase.

TABLE 1
CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

Activity	Duration	Estimated Completion
Site Preparation	2 Months	August 2024
Grading	1 Month	August 2024
Building Construction	11 Months	February 2026
Paving	1 Month	March 2025



SOURCE: Dreyfuss+Blackford, 2024

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 5
Proposed Project Landscaping Plan

Project Operation

Project operation is expected to begin in 2026. At full buildout of Phase I of the proposed project, residents will have access to medical care, dental care, behavioral health services, pharmacy, diabetes management, a maternal child health program, and care coordination to address social navigation and case management needs. The facility will initially have capacity for up to approximately 8,000 patients.

As the facility expands and patient populations grow, Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility will add more service providers within core services and additional administrative space as part of future phases. Capacity is expected to increase to up to approximately 16,000 patients.

SECTION 4. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

This Initial Study will evaluate this project in light of the previously approved General Plan EIR, and the Northwest Rocklin Annexation Area EIR, which are hereby incorporated by reference. This document is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Division, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA, and can also be found on the City's website under Planning Division, Publications and Maps.

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

This Initial Study has also been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15063 and 15168. Section 15063 sets forth the general rules for preparing Initial Studies. One of the identified functions of an Initial Study is for a lead agency to "[d]etermine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project's effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration... The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration." (CEQA Guidelines, section 15063,

subd. (b)(1)(C).). Here, the City has used this initial study to determine the extent to which the General Plan EIR has “adequately examined” the effects of the proposed project.

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

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Later activities in the program must be examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
 - (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. That later analysis may tier from the program EIR as provided in Section 15152.
 - (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no subsequent EIR would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. Whether a later activity is within the scope of a program EIR is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record. Factors that an agency may consider in making that determination include, but are not limited to, consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure, as described in the program EIR.
 - (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into later activities in the program.
 - (4) Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR.
 - (5) A program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with later activities if it provides a description of planned activities that would implement the program and deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. With a good and detailed project description and analysis of the program, many

later activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required.

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

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

B. Significant Cumulative Impacts; Statement of Overriding Considerations

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

1. Air Quality:

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

2. Aesthetics/Light and Glare:

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

3. Traffic and Circulation:

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

4. Noise

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

5. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

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

6. Biological Resources

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

7. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

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

C. Mitigation Measures Required and Considered

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

Area EIR have been, or will be, implemented as set forth in that document, and evaluates this Project accordingly.

D. Evaluation of Environmental Checklist:

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

E. Environmental Checklist

I. AESTHETICS Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:					
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center on 13.1 acres would change the existing visual nature and character of the project site and area. The development of the project site would create new sources of light and glare typical of urban development. As discussed below, impacts to scenic vistas or viewsheds would not be anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to the visual character of the Planning Area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. When previously undeveloped land becomes developed, aesthetic impacts include changes to scenic character and new sources of light and glare (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.3-1 through 4.3-18). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Elements, and include policies that encourage the use of design standards for unique areas and the protection of natural resources, including open space areas, natural resource areas, hilltops, waterways and oak trees, from the encroachment of incompatible land use.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for aesthetic/visual impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista - *No Impact.*

While vacant or mostly vacant areas have a natural aesthetic quality, there are no designated scenic vistas within the City of Rocklin or Planning Area. Alteration of the vacant and undeveloped project site through the construction of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center would change the visual quality of the project site and surrounding area. However, since there are no designated scenic vistas, no impact would occur in this regard.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway – *No Impact*.

The City of Rocklin does not contain an officially designated state scenic highway. State Route 65 (SR 65) borders the western portion of the City and is nearby the project site, but it is not considered a scenic highway. Likewise, Interstate 80 (I-80) traverses the eastern portion of the City but does not have a scenic designation. Therefore, the proposed development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center at this project site would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and no impacts are anticipated in association with damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The development of a health center at this project site would result in the construction of structures which would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings.

Per Public Resources Code section 21071 (a) (2), the City of Rocklin is considered to be an urbanized area because although its population is less than 100,000 persons, the population of Rocklin and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities (the cities of Roseville and Lincoln) combined equals at least 100,000 persons. The approximately 97,000-square-foot health center would be of consistent height and scale with surrounding existing and entitled development, including the United Natural Foods facility, and including the nearby Villas at Stanford Ranch and the Atherton Tech Center Business Park, as well as the anticipated future completion of the West Oaks Townhomes and future development of other surrounding vacant properties. There are no unusual development characteristics of this proposed project which would introduce incompatible elements or create aesthetic impacts not considered in the prior EIR. Existing buildings in the area include one-, two- and three-story office buildings, one-story light industrial warehouse buildings and three-story multi-family residential buildings. These buildings and the anticipated future development of buildings within the nearby and adjacent light industrial and retail commercial land use designations are collectively all of similar size and scale to the proposed project.

All development in the Rocklin Planning Area is subject to existing City development standards set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance and the City's Design Review Guidelines which help to ensure that development form, character, height, and massing are consistent with the City's vision for the character of the community. The proposed project at this project site would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The change in the aesthetics of the visual nature or character of the site and its surroundings is consistent with the surrounding existing development and future development that is

anticipated by the City's General Plan. As noted above, the General Plan EIR concluded that development under the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable aesthetic impacts and Statements of Overriding Consideration were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these cumulative impacts. The proposed project at this site does not result in a change to the finding because the site would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center at this project site would result in the construction of structures which would alter the aesthetics of the project site and its surroundings.

There are no specific features within the proposed project that would create unusual light and glare. New and/or increased sources of light and glare would be introduced to the project area. However, implementation of existing City Design Review Guidelines and the General Plan policies addressing light and glare would also ensure that no unusual daytime glare or nighttime lighting is produced. These guidelines and policies would require the following: 1) all exterior lighting is to be designed and installed to avoid adverse glare on adjacent properties and to incorporate "dark sky" provisions; 2) Cut-off decorative light fixtures, or equivalent, shall be used for parking lot and building mounted lighting and mounted such that all light is projected directly toward the ground; 3) the lighting shall be reviewed and revised if needed to avoid "hot spots" under parking lot lights and to eliminate light spill over the property lines that exceeds 0.1 foot candles, and 4) light poles shall be a maximum of 20 feet in height as measured from grade to the top of the light fixture itself. However, the impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the project area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated.

The General Plan EIR acknowledged that impacts associated with increased light and glare would not be eliminated entirely, and the overall level of light and glare in the project area would increase in general as urban development occurs and that increase cannot be fully mitigated. As noted above, the General Plan EIR concluded that development under the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable aesthetic impacts and a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to these cumulative impacts. The project does not result in a change to the finding because the site would be developed with typical urban uses that are consistent and compatible with surrounding existing and anticipated future development.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

There are no agricultural or forestry impacts for the project or project site due to a lack of these resources on the project site, as further discussed below.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? – *No Impact*

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract – *No Impact*

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use - *No Impact*.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) land classifications system monitors and documents land use changes that specifically affect California's agricultural land and is administered by the California Department of Conservation (CDC). The FMMP land classification system is cited by the State CEQA Guidelines as the preferred information source for determining the agricultural significance of a property (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). The CDC's 2022 California Important Farmland Finder designates the project site as Grazing Land. This category is not considered Important Farmland under the definition in CEQA of "Agricultural Land" that is afforded consideration as to its potential significance (see CEQA Section 21060.1[a]), nor is it considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Also, the project site contains no parcels that are under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, because the project would not convert important farmland to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing agricultural or forestry use zoning or Williamson Act contracts, or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses, there would be no agricultural use impacts.

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g)) – *No Impact*

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use – *No Impact*.

The project site contains no parcels that are considered forestry lands or timberland. Therefore, because the project would not conflict with existing forestry use zoning or involve other changes that could result in the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, there would be no forestry use impacts.

III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project:					
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan?			X		
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

In the short-term, air quality impacts from the proposed project will result from construction related activities associated with grading and excavation to prepare the site for the installation of utilities and above ground structures and improvements. These air quality impacts will primarily be related to the generation of airborne dust (Particulate Matter of 10 microns in size or less (PM₁₀)).

In the long term, air quality impacts from the proposed project will result from vehicle trip generation to and from the project site and the resultant mobile source emissions of air pollutants (primarily carbon monoxide and ozone precursor emissions).

As discussed below, development of the proposed project would not be expected to create objectionable odors.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to regional air quality as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included 8-hour ozone attainment, short-term construction emissions, operational air pollutants, increases in criteria pollutants, odors, and regional air quality impacts. (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.2-1 through 4.2-43). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use, the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation, and the Circulation Elements, and include policies that encourage a mixture of land uses, provisions for non-automotive modes of transportation, consultation with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), and the incorporation of stationary and mobile source control measures.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for air quality impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Environmental Science Associates, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report (AQ/GHG) for the proposed project. The report, dated May 21, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. City staff have reviewed the documentation and find that Environmental Science Associates has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on a review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Environmental Science Associates report, which are summarized below.

This analysis evaluated potential impacts from Phase 1 development of the 62,193-square foot building, followed by Phase 2 development of the two additional buildings of 15,000 square feet and 20,000 square feet.

Criteria pollutant emissions for construction and operation were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model[®] (CalEEMod), Version 2022.1.15. CalEEMod estimates the emissions that result from various land uses, and includes considerations for trip generation rates, vehicle mix, average trip length by trip type, and average speed. In addition, CalEEMod calculates emissions from building occupancy uses that include natural gas for space and water heating and consumer product use of products containing volatile organic compounds, also known as reactive organic gases (ROG). Project-specific data provided by the applicant was input into the CalEEMod model, and model default data was used where information was not provided.

Construction Emissions

During construction of the project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate on the project site. Construction exhaust emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction workers' commute, and construction material hauling for the entire construction period. These activities would involve the use of diesel-powered equipment that would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ozone precursors [ROG and nitrogen oxides (NO_x)], and inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀). Project construction activities also represent a source of fugitive dust, which includes PM₁₀. Construction is a potential concern because the proposed project is in a non-attainment area for ozone and PM₁₀.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including, but not limited to, the following, which would be noted with City-approved construction plans:

- Rule 202 related to visible emissions; Rule 217 related to asphalt paving materials; Rule 218 related to architectural coatings; Rule 228 related to fugitive dust, and Regulation 3 related to open burning.

The analysis found that the overall project's maximum daily unmitigated emissions from construction operations would be as shown in **Table AQ-1**:

**TABLE AQ-1
MAXIMUM DAILY UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS**

	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) (lbs/day)	Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) (lbs/day)	Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) (lbs/day)
Maximum Daily Emissions	5.7	54.3	29.5
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	82	82	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

The emissions presented in Table AQ-1 are the maximum daily between Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction. Phase 1 construction resulted in the higher, daily maximum emissions.

The project's short-term construction-related emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Therefore, construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone and PM₁₀. Accordingly, construction of the proposed project would not violate any ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is necessary to reduce exposure to sensitive receptors from PM₁₀ emissions (in the form of diesel particulate matter), as discussed below in impact (c).

To address the project's potential impacts to air quality, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Use of Tier 4 Final Engines for Construction Equipment.

All diesel off-road equipment shall have engines that meet the Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards, as certified by CARB. This requirement shall be verified through submittal of an equipment inventory to the City of Rocklin prior to any construction activities that includes the following information: (1) Type of Equipment, (2) Engine Year and Age, (3) Number of Years Since Rebuild of Engine (if applicable), (4) Type of Fuel Used, (5) Engine HP, (6) Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS) information if applicable and other related equipment data. A Certification Statement is also required to be made by the Contractor for documentation of compliance and for future review by the air district as necessary. The Certification Statement must state that the Contractor agrees to compliance and acknowledges that a violation of this requirement shall constitute a breach of compliance.

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will reduce impacts to air quality to a less than significant level.

Table AQ-2 below presents the mitigated emissions from construction, which would still be less than the significance thresholds.

**TABLE AQ-2
MAXIMUM DAILY MITIGATED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS**

	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) (lbs/day)	Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) (lbs/day)	Inhalable Particulate Matter(PM ₁₀) (lbs/day)
Maximum Daily Emissions	1.03	6.44	11.0
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	82	82	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ would be generated by the project from both mobile and area sources associated with building occupancy. Day-to-day vehicle trips to and from the project site would make up the majority of the operational emissions. Emissions would also occur from area, or building use, sources such as natural gas combustion from heating mechanisms, landscape maintenance equipment exhaust, and consumer products (e.g., deodorants, cleaning products, spray paint, etc.). The modeling performed for the project takes these factors into consideration.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, such as those listed previously for construction, as well as the following for operations:

- Rule 225 related to wood-burning appliances, and Rule 246 related to water heaters.

The analysis found that the overall project's maximum operational emissions on a daily basis would be as shown in **Table AQ-3**.

**TABLE AQ-3
MAXIMUM DAILY UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) (lbs/day)	Nitrous Oxides (NOx) (lbs/day)	Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) (lbs/day)
Maximum Daily Emissions	17.9	15.1	21.7
Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Significance Thresholds	55	55	82
Exceedance of PCAPCD Threshold	NO	NO	NO

As shown, the project's operational emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the project's operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and operation-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Air Quality

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

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

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS, and thus result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM₁₀ are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's operational-level thresholds, the project would conflict with relevant attainment plans and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. Conversely, if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions are less than operational-level thresholds, the project would not conflict with the relevant attainment plan.

As shown in the Maximum Unmitigated Operational Emissions table above, the proposed project would generate ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that would be below the operational-level thresholds; therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative emissions of criteria pollutants for which the PCAPCD area is in non-attainment would not be considerable.

The General Plan EIR identified a cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts as a significant and unavoidable impact, and the City of Rocklin adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in recognition of this impact. The proposed project would not result in a change to this finding because the project does not result in short-term, long-term or cumulative air quality emissions that exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan – *Less Than Significant Impact*; and

b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard – *Less Than Significant Impact*.

The development of the proposed project would involve construction and operational activities that would generate air pollutant emissions.

The proposed project area is located within the SVAB and is under the jurisdiction of the PCAPCD. The SVAB is designated nonattainment for the federal PM_{2.5} and the State PM₁₀ standards, as well as for both the federal and State ozone standards. The federal Clean Air Act requires areas designated as federal nonattainment to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures for states to use to attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of air basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. In compliance with regulations, the PCAPCD periodically prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions via regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 2009 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Ozone Attainment Plan), updated July 24, 2017.

The Ozone Attainment Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) also strengthened the secondary 8-hour ozone NAAQS, making the secondary standard identical to the primary standard. The SVAB remains classified as a severe nonattainment area with an attainment deadline of 2027. On October 26, 2015 the USEPA released a final implementation rule for the revised NAAQS for ozone to address the requirements for reasonable further progress, modeling and attainment demonstrations, and reasonably available control measures (RACM) and reasonably available control technology (RACT). On April 30, 2018 the USEPA published designations for areas in attainment/unclassifiable for the 2015 ozone standards. The USEPA identified the portions of Placer County within the SVAB as nonattainment for the 2015 ozone standards. Due to the designation of the SVAB as nonattainment for the 2015 standards, the PCAPCD will work with other regional air districts to prepare a new ozone SIP for the revised 2015 standards.

General conformity requirements of the regional air quality plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. In order to evaluate ozone and other criteria air pollutant emissions and support attainment goals for those pollutants for which the area is designated nonattainment, the PCAPCD has recently proposed updates to the District's recommended significance thresholds for emissions of PM₁₀, and ozone precursors ROG and NO_x. On October 13, 2016 the PCAPCD adopted updated thresholds of significance of the aforementioned pollutants which are shown in **Table AQ-4**.

The significance thresholds, expressed in pounds per day (lbs/day), listed in Table AQ-4 are the PCAPCD's current recommended thresholds of significance for use in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with proposed development projects. The City of Rocklin, as lead agency, is utilizing the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for CEQA evaluation purposes. Thus, if a project's emissions exceed the PCAPCD's pollutant thresholds presented above, the project could have a significant effect on air quality, the attainment of federal and State AAQS, and could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

TABLE AQ-4
PCAPCD THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Pollutant	Construction Threshold (lbs/day)	Operational Threshold (lbs/day)
ROG	82	55
NO _x	82	55
PM ₁₀	82	82
Source: PCAPCD, 2017.		

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

As shown in the Construction Emissions and Operational Emissions tables above (**Tables AQ-1 and AQ-3** respectively), the proposed project's construction and operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would be below the applicable PCAPCD thresholds of significance. These thresholds consider strategies for attaining air quality standards. Accordingly, the project's construction and operational emissions would not contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status of ozone and PM, operations of the project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and construction-related and operation-related impacts would be considered less than significant.

For cumulative emissions, the PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions and the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be greater than the PCAPCD's operational-level thresholds,

the project could be expected to conflict with relevant attainment plans and could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. As shown in the Operational Emissions table above (**Table AQ-3**), the proposed project would generate ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ emissions that would be below the applicable operational-level thresholds. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and the impact would be considered less than significant.

c. Sensitive Receptors – Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would generate air toxic contaminant emissions that could potentially impact sensitive receptors.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others, due to the types of population groups or activities involved. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and/or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, childcare centers, retirement homes, and convalescent homes. The proposed project would construct a new medical facility across Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard from existing, residential receptors.

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are also a category of environmental concern. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC. Health risks associated with DPM are primarily associated with long-term exposure and associated risk of contracting cancer.

Due to the nature of the project, vehicle trips associated with the project would be mainly gasoline-fueled and not associated with substantial TAC emissions, and the project does not include long-term operation of any stationary diesel engine or other on-site stationary source of TACs. As such, the proposed project would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations.

Construction-related activities could result in the generation of DPM from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. Due to the proximity of sensitive receptors, a health risk assessment of DPM from construction activities was conducted to evaluate the increase in cancer risk associated with the construction of the proposed project. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) recommends analysis of impacts from TACs from activities lasting longer than two months. The proposed project's construction period for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 would be approximately two years.

Emissions of TACs related to operational activities are typically associated with stationary diesel engines. The project is not expected to generate heavy truck traffic or involve the use of forklifts or other stationary diesel-fueled equipment, nor would it include a diesel-fueled emergency

backup generator. Any future, potential stationary sources (e.g. generator) would be required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, including obtaining permits to operate, if any stationary diesel engines are proposed.

Construction Health Risk Assessment

The firm of Environmental Science Associates, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) report for the proposed project. The report, dated May 21, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. City staff have reviewed the documentation and find that Environmental Science Associates has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on a review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Environmental Science Associates report, which are summarized below.

A health risk assessment (HRA) was conducted to evaluate the cancer risk at nearby sensitive receptors from project construction DPM emissions. The risks were evaluated at nearby sensitive receptors adjacent to West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard, and the results are presented for the maximally exposed individual resident (MEIR). The MEIR is a residence to the south, across West Stanford Ranch Road. The operational phase of the proposed project would not generate substantial TAC emissions, so these emissions were not included in the analysis as the health risk impacts are minimal.

The HRA follows the protocols outlined by the PCAPCD, CARB, the OEHHA, and the USEPA. Consistent with guidelines and recommendations from these agencies, the HRA evaluated the estimated incremental increase in cancer risks from exposure to DPM emissions from heavy construction equipment and trucks.

The OEHHA guidelines for HRAs provide age sensitivity factors to apply to the cancer risk calculation. These factors reflect the increased sensitivity of children to the effects of carcinogens. In addition, children have higher breathing rates, which increases the intake of pollutants. The modeling exposure assumptions conservatively assume a child in the age group from third-trimester fetus to 2 years of age, which is the age group most susceptible to DPM emissions from a cancer risk perspective, could be living at the residence near the project site.

The HRA was conducted using the U.S. EPA AERMOD dispersion model (version 22112) and uses measured meteorology to predict conservative concentrations at specific locations defined by a Cartesian coordinate system. Diesel construction equipment would be used during the site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating phases. A conservative representation of the on-site construction equipment within the proposed project site was modeled as a polygon area source for the 62,193-square foot Phase 1 building and two, rectangular area sources of 15,000 square feet and 20,000 square feet for the future Phase 2 buildings. On-road, heavy truck trips to and from the project site were modeled as line-area

sources along West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard. The modeling parameters are as follows:

Polygon and rectangular area sources covering the project site, with;

- Release height of 5 meters for construction equipment exhaust;
- Initial vertical dimension of 1.4 meters;
- Emissions occurring only between the hours of 7 AM and 4 PM¹;

Line-area sources representing the haul routes along West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard, with:

- Release height of 2.55 meters for haul truck exhaust;
- Initial vertical dimension of 2.37 meters;
- Emissions occurring only between the hours of 7 AM and 4 PM, and;
- Receptor flagpole height of 1.5 meters (ground-level receptor at breathing height).

The sources were modeled with an emission rate of one gram per second to obtain a dispersion factor (unit concentration) at each receptor location. Emissions of exhaust PM₁₀ were assumed to be DPM. The DPM concentrations were calculated using the dispersion factors and the DPM emissions from Table AQ-1 and AQ-2.

The cancer risk (expressed as a probability per million) was calculated using the resulting DPM concentrations along with equations and factors from the OEHHA 2015 Risk Assessment Guidelines.² The maximum modeled cancer risk at the MEIR is 18.9 in one million, based on the unmitigated DPM (PM₁₀) emissions in Table AQ-1. Mitigation measure AQ-1 would reduce the DPM (PM₁₀) emissions, as shown in Table AQ-2, and would reduce this risk to 2.2 in one million. The unmitigated cancer risk at the MEIR is greater than the PCAPCD significance threshold of 10 per million, but the mitigated cancer risk at the MEIR is below the significance threshold, resulting in a less than significant impact with mitigation applied.

Modeling assumptions, equations, and the cancer risk calculations are included in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report for the proposed project. The report, dated May 21, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA.

d. Odors – Less Than Significant Impact.

Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment

¹ Construction hours provided by the applicant.

² Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program – Risk Assessment Guidelines*, February 2015, http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/hotspots2015.html, accessed July 2020.

facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. The proposed project does not involve such land uses nor is it located near any such land uses. Although less common, emissions of DPM from heavy-duty diesel truck traffic could result in objectionable odors. While the proposed project would increase the total amount of vehicle trips in the area, the increase in area vehicle activity would not necessarily create an increase in heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, because the traffic increase would mostly be a result of the medical clinic uses, which would involve single passenger vehicles that are not typically considered to be sources of objectionable odors.

Diesel fumes associated with diesel-fueled equipment and heavy-duty trucks, such as from construction activities or operations of emergency generators, could be found to be objectionable. However, as addressed above, construction is temporary and construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day and would likely only occur over portions of the project area at a time.

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

Because the proposed project does not include the development of odor-generating land uses or development in proximity to odor-generating land uses, because the increase in project area traffic would be largely through increased use of passenger vehicles rather than heavy-duty diesel trucks, and considering the intermittent nature and short-term duration of construction activities, the project would not result in the exposure of residences or other sensitive receptors to objectionable odors or result in other emissions such as those leading to the creation of objectionable odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Data Sources/Methodology:

The firm of Environmental Science Associates, a California consulting firm with recognized expertise in biological resources, prepared a Biological Resources Technical Report for the approximately 13 acres total project site, which included the staging area, construction site, and access roads. The report, dated May 21, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. City staff have reviewed the documentation and find that Environmental Science Associates has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on a review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Environmental Science Associates report, which are summarized below.

Overview

As part of the assessment, a background investigation of the proposed project site (project site) was conducted which included queries of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC). The United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangles used in the above database queries include Sheridan, Lincoln, Gold Hill, Pleasant Grove, Roseville, Rocklin, Rio Linda, Citrus Heights, and Folsom. A biological resource reconnaissance survey was conducted on August 10, 2023, to determine: 1) plant communities present in the study area; 2) if existing conditions provided suitable habitat for any special-status plant or wildlife species, and 3) if sensitive habitats are present. The results of the field reconnaissance survey were compiled into the Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic Biological Resources Technical Report, and is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The analysis presented in this section is based on this report.

Project Site Description:

The proposed project is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Rocklin, located in Placer County. The City is approximately 22 miles northeast of the City of Sacramento and 14 miles southwest of the City of Auburn.

The proposed project is located in the Loomis Basin situated in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada Range. Mountain uplift and volcanic activity in the Sierra Nevada Range and erosion off the crest of the mountains influenced the regional geology of the Rocklin area. No prime soil has been identified in the area, and it is generally of poor quality. The elevation of the City of Rocklin ranges from 150 to 525 feet above mean sea level (AMSL).

The proposed project would construct a new health care facility on undeveloped land in the northern area of the City of Rocklin. The site is approximately 13 acres along West Stanford Ranch Road. The first phase of the proposed plan would develop approximately 8 acres of the total site

with an approximately 62,193-square foot medical office, dental clinic, and optometry facility. The proposed building would be a two-story structure that would be visible as a single-story structure from the West Stanford Ranch Road right of way. There is a planned future phase that would include the development of two additional buildings of 15,000 square feet and 20,000 square feet, as discussed in more detail above in Section 3, Project Description.

Biological Communities

One biological community was identified on the overall project site: grassland. The project site is predominantly grassland habitat. Plant species observed within the grassland community include Pitgland tarweed (*Holocarpha virgata*), Turkey mullein (*Croton setiger*), oat species (*Avena Sp.*), and barley species (*Hordeum sp.*).

Special-Status Plant and Animal Species

Special-status species are regulated under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts or other regulations or are species that are considered sufficiently rare by the scientific community to qualify for such listing. These species are classified under the following categories:

1. Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Section 17.12 [listed plants] and Section 17.11 [listed animals], and various notices in the Federal Register [proposed species]).
2. Species that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (Federal Register Title 61, Number 40, February 28, 1996).
3. Species listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 670.5).
4. Plants listed as rare or endangered under the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code, Section 1900 et seq.).
5. Animal species of special concern to CDFW.
6. Animals fully protected under the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3511 [birds], 4700 [mammals], and 5050 [reptiles and amphibians]).
7. Species that meet the definitions of rare and endangered under CEQA. CEQA Section 15380 provides that a plant or animal species may be treated as “rare or endangered” even if not on one of the official lists (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).
8. Plants considered by CNPS and CDFW to be “rare, threatened or endangered in California” (California Rare Plant Rank 1A, 1B, and 2 in CNPS 2022).

Plants

Based on a review of the resource databases noted above, the specific habitat characteristics of the overall project site, and Table 1 in the Biological Resources Technical Report prepared for this project, there are no special-status plant species with a moderate to high potential to occur in the project site.

Wildlife

Based upon a review of resource databases noted above, habitat characteristics, and Table 2 in the Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic Biological Resources Technical Report, there is one special-status animal species with a moderate potential to occur on the overall project site: Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). This species is discussed in more detail below:

Foraging or Nesting Raptor/Passerine Species

Swainson's hawk bird species was identified as having a moderate potential to occur on the project site. Suitable grassland habitat for foraging occurs in the project site; however, no trees or riparian habitat, where nesting behavior is likely to take place, occur in the project site.

Wildlife movement corridors

The project site was evaluated for the presence or absence of wildlife movement corridors. No wildlife corridors to and from the project site were identified. Pleasant Grove Creek is north of the project site and passes under Wildcat Boulevard to an adjacent wetland habitat northeast of the project site. The project site is otherwise surrounded by urban development to the east, south, and west and does not function as a wildlife corridor.

Project Impacts and Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation

Approach to the Analysis

The impact analysis is based on the resources, references, and data collection methods identified in the Local Setting discussion in the *Data Sources/Methodology* section. The analysis addresses potential direct and indirect impacts from construction or operation of the proposed Project, defined as follows:

- Direct impacts are those that could occur at the same time and place as project implementation, such as the removal of habitat as a result of grading.
- Indirect impacts are those that could occur either at a later time or at a distance from the Project area, but that are reasonably foreseeable such as night work where there is a potential for light spillover to disrupt migratory patterns or roosting behavior.

Direct and indirect impacts on biological resources may vary in duration; they may be temporary or permanent.

- Temporary impacts are those that occur at the same time as the project construction such as construction noise and air pollution.
- Permanent impacts are those that occur such as loss of habitat from vegetation removal, lighting from proposed project.

The analysis considers the potential impacts of the proposed project on suitable habitat, special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife corridors, and conflicts with local policies affecting biological resources, using the significance criteria listed below. Mitigation measures are identified as necessary, to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Significance Conclusions

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – *Less Than Significant*.

Special-Status Plants:

There is low potential for special-status species to occur on the project site, which is below the threshold for the project to be considered to have a potentially significant impact to special status plant species.

Special-Status Wildlife:

Swainson's Hawk

The Swainson's hawk is listed as a California state threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. Swainson's hawks are known to forage in grassland habitat which is present in the project site. The area within the project site and surrounding vicinity (0.5-mile buffer) lacks suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk due to the lack of large trees in suitable woodland and riparian forest habitat. Furthermore, no nests in use by Swainson's hawk within the last five years (active nests) are documented in the CNDDDB within 10 miles of the project site. Thus, while the project site contains grassland habitat, it is unlikely that the site is used by this species for foraging. As such, the impacts to the Swainson's hawk foraging habitat are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service – *No Impact*.

No sensitive natural communities or riparian habitat are present on the project site. Therefore, no impact on sensitive natural communities would occur and no mitigation is required.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means – *No Impact*.

No wetlands or other aquatic resources are present on the project site. Therefore, no impact on state or federally protected species would occur and no mitigation is required.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites – *Less Than Significant With Mitigation*.

There is no impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish species. There is potential for impact on movement of wildlife species.

Native Wildlife Nursery Sites

Native wildlife nursery sites in the study area would primarily include sites suitable for communally nesting or roosting birds or individual nesting birds. Potential construction- and operations-related impacts and mitigation measures on individual special-status birds are discussed above under Issue a. No suitable habitat in the study area for rookeries was observed. Native migratory birds and their nests are protected under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Nests of common bird species (e.g., ground nesting birds) could be present in the grasslands within the study area, which could be affected by construction-related vegetation removal and ground disturbance.

To address the project's potential impact to common bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the following mitigation measure is being applied to the project

Mitigation Measure BIO-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Nesting Birds, would reduce construction-related impacts to native nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Nesting Birds:

If feasible, the applicant shall conduct all construction-related activities related to vegetation clearing, grading, or other ground disturbing activities during the non-breeding season (between August 16 and February 14) for migratory birds. If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the breeding season, a qualified avian biologist shall conduct a nesting survey within 15 days of the start of ground-disturbing or construction activities within the appropriate grassland habitat. If no nests are found during this survey, no further actions are required. If an active nest is found within the BSA, CDFW shall be consulted to determine an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active and the young have fledged.

Native Wildlife Movement Corridors

The project site is not a known corridor; however, it can be assumed that numerous birds pass overhead or in the project vicinity during spring and fall migrations. In addition, resident birds make daily localized flights at low elevations while they forage, disperse, and flee from predators or other threats.

Construction

Construction activities of the proposed project could interfere with local movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species.

Grading and other ground-disturbing activities could temporarily disrupt the movement of small mammals such as ground squirrels. However, construction work would not substantially interfere with the movement of these species because they could move through adjacent unaffected habitat.

Construction activities including equipment and personnel movement, and vegetation removal, could interfere with the movement of other terrestrial wildlife species such as small mammals or birds. However, these activities are not expected to cause substantial effects on the movement

of these species, which are mobile and can move away from construction areas to unaffected habitat.

Project construction noise could temporarily alter the foraging patterns of resident wildlife species in the project area, but it is not anticipated to substantially interfere with foraging because these species could move to nearby unaffected habitat.

Project construction at night could interfere with the movement and migration of birds. Indirect light spillover could temporarily alter nighttime migration patterns. However, these activities are not expected to substantially disrupt movement and migration because the project site and project site vicinity are not known wildlife corridors, and the surrounding area is mostly urban development.

Although construction work for the proposed project could temporarily alter the movement patterns of native resident or migratory wildlife species, it is not anticipated to substantially interfere with the movement of these terrestrial species, which could move to nearby unaffected habitat. The project site and surrounding area is not a known wildlife corridor.

Operations/Maintenance

Operations and maintenance of the proposed project could interfere with effects on migratory and resident birds moving through an area. However, the proposed project is not expected to substantially increase the amount of nighttime uplighting on the project site relative to existing conditions. The project site is surrounded by developed and disturbed landscape with limited habitat for birds near the project and is not a known wildlife corridor.

In conclusion, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the project would have less than significant impact on resident and migratory terrestrial wildlife species.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance – *No Impact.*

The City of Rocklin General Plan policies OCR-42 and OCR-43 require all projects to mitigate for the loss of oak trees and the impacts to oak woodland that result from development. To comply with these policies, the City of Rocklin relies on the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Oak Tree Preservation Guidelines to determine project impacts and appropriate mitigation for the removal of and construction within the dripline of native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 6 inches or more at 4.5 feet above ground level. Seven oak species and five hybrids between these species are defined as “native oaks” by the City. Per the City’s oak tree ordinance, the diameter at breast height (DBH) of a multiple trunk tree is the measurement of the largest trunk only, and heritage trees are defined as native oak trees with a trunk diameter of 24 inches or more.

The City of Rocklin commissioned the firm of Phytosphere Research to evaluate, characterize, and make recommendations on the City’s urban forest, and from that effort, a 2006 report titled “Planning for the Future of Rocklin’s Urban Forest” was produced. One of the findings of this report was that the City’s overall tree canopy cover has increased from 11% in 1952 to 18% in 2003 (a 63% increase) due to the protection of existing oaks and growth of both new and existing

trees. This finding supports the City's on-going practice of requiring mitigation for oak tree removal through its Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance as being an effective way to maintain or even increase urban forest canopy.

Although an arborist report was not submitted in association with the proposed project, based upon site visits, there are no native oak trees within the boundaries of the project site that would be regulated by the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance; therefore, the proposed project is not in conflict with any local or regional policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, and no impact to trees would occur.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan – *No Impact.*

No habitat conservation plans (HCP) or natural community conservation plans are applicable to the project site. The City of Rocklin is outside the plan area covered by the Placer County Conservation Program. As a result, no conflicts with the provisions of an adopted HCP would occur, and no mitigation is required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		X			

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center on 13.1 acres of undeveloped former ranch land at the project site would entail ground disturbance that could potentially impact unknown/undiscovered historical resources, unique archaeological resources and/or human remains as development occurs.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to historical and cultural resources (including human remains) within the Planning area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included potential destruction or damage to any historical and cultural resources (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.8-1 through 4.8-21). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Open Space, Recreation and Conservation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage the preservation and protection of historical and cultural resources and the proper treatment and handling of such resources when they are discovered.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

Environmental Science Associates (ESA), a consulting firm with recognized expertise in California cultural resources, prepared a cultural resources survey report for the project site. The report, dated September 15, 2023, is not available for public review due to the need to protect the confidentiality of Native American cultural place information in compliance with federal and State rules and regulations, but is on file with the City of Rocklin. The report's basic findings are incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration by reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Environmental Science Associates has a professional reputation that makes their conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Environmental Science Associates report, which is summarized below.

In summary, the ESA report included a records search of the North Central Information Center (NCIC), archival research, field parcel survey effort performed by a qualified archaeologist, a request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a search of the Sacred Lands File Inventory, and notification of Native American contacts recommended by the NAHC. A formal request to NAHC was sent on July 31, 2023, and a relevant contacts list was provided in response on August 28, 2023. The records searches revealed that the project site contains one historic period resource [P-31-000773 (CA-PLA-647H) a network of stacked rock walls, fence alignments, and associated fencing materials] that has previously been determined by the United States Army Corps of Engineers as not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Additionally, this resource was inspected by ESA during field survey of the project site and found to be in a state of ruins or entirely destroyed, and therefore, recommended as not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (California Register). During the field survey, no evidence was found of pre-contact or additional historic period artifacts, or evidence of previous habitation within the project site. While unlikely, the project site may contain unknown cultural resources that could potentially be discovered during construction activities. See Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, for more detail regarding inadvertent discovery.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 – *Less Than Significant Impact*.

A significant impact could occur if the project would cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource, herein referring to historic-era architectural resources or the built environment, including buildings, structures, and objects, through physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource. CEQA Statutes Section 21084.1 identifies historic resources as those listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register, based on a range of criteria, including association with events or patterns of events that have made significant contributions to broad patterns of historical development in the United States or California, including local, regional, or specific cultural patterns (California Register Criterion 1), structures which are directly associated with important persons in the history of the state or country (Criterion 2), which embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period, or other aesthetic importance (Criterion 3), or which have the potential to reveal important information about the prehistory or history of the state or the nation (such as archaeological sites) (Criterion 4).

In addition to meeting at least one of the above criteria, a resource must typically be over 50 years old (a State guideline rather than a statutory requirement) and have retained historic integrity sufficient to be clearly evident as a historic resource through a combination of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association with historic patterns. The definition of “integrity” in this context is based on criteria established by the National Register.

The project site is not known to contain any historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the project archaeologist concluded that there are no identified cultural resources on the project site that are considered eligible for the National or California Registers; therefore, no impacts to historical resources are anticipated.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 – *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation*.

Archaeological resources can be considered historical resources, according to Section 15064.5, as well as unique archaeological resources, as defined in Section 21083.2(g). A significant impact could occur if the project would cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource through physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource. While no archaeological resources were found during the ESA study, as noted above, the project site may contain unknown/undiscovered cultural resources.

To address the project’s potential impact of the discovery of unknown cultural resources, the following mitigation measure, agreed to by the applicant, is being applied to the project:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Implement Mitigation Measures Recommendations to Avoid Damaging Effects on Tribal Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources:

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

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e) (1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City's Environmental Coordinator shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).

This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will limit impacts to known and unknown/ undiscovered archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries – *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.*

No evidence of human remains is known to exist at the project site. However, in the event that during construction activities, human remains of Native American origin are discovered on the project site during project construction activities, it would be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall under the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resources Code Section 5097). In addition, State law (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5) requires Mitigation Measure CUL-1 be implemented should human remains be discovered; the implementation of which will limit impacts related to the discovery of human remains to a less than significant level.

VI. ENERGY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of the medical facility buildings for the Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility would result in construction and operational activities which would be anticipated to use energy resources, but it is anticipated that such use would not be in a wasteful or inefficient manner, nor would such use conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur related to the cumulative demand for electrical and natural gas services as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included an increased demand for electrical and natural gas services, energy consumption impacts, and a cumulative increase in demand for electrical and natural gas services and associated infrastructure and increased infrastructure expansions to serve future development (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-34, pages 4.13-23 through 4.13-32 and pages 5.0-47 through 5.0-48). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Public Services and Facilities and Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage coordination with utility service providers and energy and resource conservation. The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in energy consumption impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24), through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would reduce energy consumption, and through compliance with local, state and federal standards related to energy consumption.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

The consumption of energy as a result of development activities is discussed in the Rocklin General Plan. Policies and mitigation measures have been included in the General Plan that encourage coordination with utility service providers and the conservation of energy and resources.

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for greenhouse gas emissions impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources – *Less Than Significant Impact.*

The development of the medical facility buildings at this project site would result in construction and operational activities which would be anticipated to use energy resources. The project would use energy resources for the operation (i.e., electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (i.e., gasoline, diesel fuel and electricity) generated by the project, and from off-road vehicles generated by and associated with the construction of the project.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) provides both electrical and natural gas service within the City of Rocklin. According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), in 2022 Placer County used a total of 3,089 million kWh of electricity. The project would increase electricity use in the county by a minimal amount. PG&E's electrical service area extends far beyond Placer County, and draws on a variety of sources for electricity, including hydroelectric, natural gas, nuclear and renewable resources. According to the CEC, in 2022 Placer County used approximately 99.4 million therms of natural gas. Similar to electricity, the project's natural gas use would represent a minimal increase of natural gas usage within the county, and a smaller portion of PG&E's total natural gas service. PG&E would be able to absorb the additional demand for electricity and natural gas that would result from the project because it would represent a very minimal increase compared to PG&E's current demand and supply, and because PG&E plans for additional development within its service area, including the City of Rocklin.

Project construction and operation would comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements, which would ensure that electricity use associated with the operation of the project would not be wasteful or inefficient.

Once constructed, the project would also increase the annual use of transportation fuel from travel to and from the project site. The project is located in proximity to public transportation facilities and pedestrian facilities, which could reduce vehicle use and the associated fuel consumption. The project does not include any elements that would result in an unusually high use of transportation fuel as compared to other, similar, development.

The project would be in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. In addition, energy providers are actively implementing measures to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and to improve energy efficiency. For example, PG&E is responsible for the mix of energy resources used to provide electricity for its customers, and it is in the process of implementing the Statewide Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) to increase the proportion of renewable energy (e.g. solar and wind) within its energy portfolio. In 2021, renewable resources provided 50 percent of PG&E's electricity supply, and 93 percent of the electricity supply came from greenhouse gas free resources³. Other Statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g. the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), would improve vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time.

For the above reasons, the project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for construction and operation of the project. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the project. The project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Rocklin, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Although improvements to City's pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems would provide further opportunities for alternative transit, the project would be linked closely with existing networks that, in large part, are sufficient for most residents or employees of the project and the City of Rocklin as a whole. For these reasons, and others (as described previously), the project would be expected to result in a less than significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.

b. Conflict or obstruct with State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency – *Less Than Significant Impact.*

The project site is not part of a state or local plan for renewable energy and the project itself does not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for energy efficiency. As noted above, the project would be required to comply with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to conflicting with or obstructing a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

³ Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation, 2022. News and Events. Available at: <https://investor.pgecorp.com/news-events/press-releases/press-release-details/2022/Creating-Our-Clean-Energy-Future-PGE-Customers-Receive-93-of-Their-Electricity-from-Greenhouse-Gas-Free-Resources/default.aspx#:~:text=PG%26E%20estimates%20that%2050%25%20of%20its%20customers%E2%80%99%20electricity,resources%2C%20including%20renewables%2C%20nuclear%20and%20large%20hydroelectric%20power..> Accessed November 2023.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Branches of the Foothill Fault system, which are not included on the Alquist-Priolo maps, pass through or near the City of Rocklin and could pose a seismic hazard to the area, including ground shaking, seismic ground failure, and landslides. Construction of the proposed project will involve clearing and grading of the site, which could render the site susceptible to a temporary increase in erosion from the grading and construction activities. However, as described below, there would be no significant impacts related to geology and soils from implementation of the proposed project.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of local soils and geology on development that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included seismic hazards such as groundshaking and liquefaction, erosion, soil stability, and wastewater conflicts (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011 pages 4.6-1 through 4.6-27). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in geological impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding geologic hazards and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to geologic conditions.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for geology and soils impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City ordinances, rules and regulations.

In addition, the project would be subject to the provisions of the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Chapter 15.28 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, Grading and Erosion

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

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

Significance Conclusions:

a., Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the state Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. – *Less than Significant Impact*; and**
- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking – *Less than Significant Impact*.**

The City of Rocklin is located in an area known to be subject to seismic hazards, but it is not near any designated Alquist-Priolo active earthquake faults. The Foothill Fault System has been identified in previous environmental studies as potentially posing a seismic hazard to the area; however, the Foothill Fault system is located near Folsom Lake, and not within the boundaries of the City of Rocklin. There are, however, two known and five inferred inactive faults within the City of Rocklin. Existing building code requirements are considered adequate to reduce potential seismic hazards related to the construction and operation of the health center development project to a less-than-significant level.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction – *Less than Significant Impact*; and**
- iv. Landslides – *Less than Significant Impact***

The project site slopes gradually from south to north from West Stanford Ranch Road. However, the site does not possess a steep grade or the slope/geological conditions that involve landslide hazards. The potential for liquefaction due to earthquakes and ground shaking is considered minimal due to the site-specific characteristics that exist in Rocklin. Rocklin is located over a

stable granite bedrock formation and much of the area is covered by volcanic mud (not unconsolidated soils which have liquefaction tendencies). Application of development standards contained in the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding geologic hazards, and compliance with local, state, and federal standards related to geologic conditions would reduce the potential impact from liquefaction and landslides for the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil – *Less Than Significant Impact.*

Standard erosion control measures are required of all projects, including revegetation and slope standards. The project proponent will be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications as a part of the City's development review process. The erosion and sediment control plan are reviewed against the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual and the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual. The erosion and sediment control plan includes the implementation of Best Management Practices/Best Available Technology (BMPs/BATs) to control construction site runoff. The project will also be required to comply with the City's Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), and the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30). The application of standard erosion control measures to the proposed project, as well as compliance with the above noted Ordinances, would reduce potential erosion-related impacts to a less than significant level for on-site grading.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse – *Less than Significant Impact; and*

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table I8-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property – *Less Than Significant Impact.*

A geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified engineer, will be required with the submittal of the project improvement plans. The report will be required to provide site-specific recommendations for the construction of all features of the building foundations and structures to ensure that their design is compatible with the soils and geology of the project site. Through the preparation of such a report and implementation of its recommendations as required by City policy during the development review process, impacts associated with unstable soil or geologic conditions for the proposed health center project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water - *No Impact.*

Sewer service is available to the project site and the proposed health center project will be served by public sewer. Septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be necessary;

therefore, there are no geologic impacts associated with the disposal of wastewater from the proposed project.

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature – *Less Than Significant Impact*.

The project site and project area are not known or considered likely to contain a unique paleontological resource or a unique geological feature; therefore, direct or indirect impacts from the project to these resources would be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

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

Area- and mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases would be generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project. Individual projects can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions by incorporating features that reduce vehicle emissions and maximize energy-efficiency.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included consistency with greenhouse gas reduction measure, climate change environmental effects on the City and generation of greenhouse gas emissions (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.15-1 through 4.15-25). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Circulation Elements and include goals and policies that encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and promote mixed use and infill development.

The General Plan EIR concluded that despite these goals and policies, significant greenhouse gas emission impacts will occur as a result of development under the General Plan and further, that these impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Specifically, the General Plan EIR found that buildout of the Rocklin General Plan will result in the generation of greenhouse gas

emissions which are cumulatively considerable. Findings of fact and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted by the Rocklin City Council in regard to this impact, which was found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for greenhouse gas emissions impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Environmental Science Associates, a Sacramento area consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality, prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report (AQ/GHG) for the proposed project. The report, dated May 21, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. City staff have reviewed the documentation and find that Environmental Science Associates has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on a review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Environmental Science Associates report, which are summarized below.

The analysis evaluated potential impacts from the development of medical facilities for the Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility in Rocklin, CA. Greenhouse gas emissions were estimated for both project construction and operation. The short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of the development of the health facilities at this project site were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model[®] (CalEEMod), Version 2022.1.15. CalEEMod estimates the emissions that result from various land uses, and includes considerations for trip generation rates, vehicle mix, average trip length by trip type, and average speed. Project-specific data provided by the applicant was input into the CalEEMod model, and model default data was used where information was not provided.

Project construction was modeled in phases, with Phase 1 construction beginning in 2024, followed by Phase 2 construction beginning in 2025. During construction of the project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate on the project site. Construction emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction workers' commute, and construction material hauling for the

entire construction period. These activities would involve the use of diesel-powered equipment that would generate greenhouse gas emissions.

Operational greenhouse gas emissions would be generated mobile sources and area sources associated with building occupancy. Mobile emissions from vehicle trips to and from the project site would make up the majority of the operational emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, similar to a greenhouse. The accumulation of GHG emissions has been implicated as a driving force for Global Climate change. Definitions of climate change vary between and across regulatory authorities and the scientific community, but in general can be described as the changing of the earth's climate caused by natural fluctuations and the impact of human activities that alter the composition of the global atmosphere.

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

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

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

of greenhouse gases (GHG). In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable" (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064 (h)(1) and 15130). To make this determination, the incremental impacts of the project must be compared to with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and probable future projects to make this determination is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MTCO₂e/yr).

Regulatory Framework

In recognition of the global scale of climate change, California has enacted several pieces of legislation in attempt to curb GHG emissions. Specifically, Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and more recently, Senate Bill (SB) 32, have established statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. Accordingly, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has prepared the Climate Change Scoping Plan for California (Scoping Plan), approved in 2008 and updated in 2014, 2017, and 2022, which provides the outline for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions and achieve the emissions reductions targets required by AB 32 and SB 32. In concert with statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, air districts, counties, and local jurisdictions throughout the State have implemented their own policies and plans to achieve emissions reductions in line with the Scoping Plan and emissions reduction targets, including AB 32 and SB 32.

On October 13, 2016 the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) adopted GHG emissions thresholds to help the District attain the GHG reduction goals established by AB 32 and SB 32. The updated thresholds specify a bright-line threshold for GHG emissions during construction activity of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr. For operational emissions, the updated thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr threshold is judged by the PCAPCD as having a less than significant impact on GHG emissions within the District and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Projects that would result in emissions above the 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr threshold would not necessarily result in substantial impacts, if certain efficiency thresholds are met. The efficiency thresholds, which are based on service populations and square footage, are presented in Table GHG-1 below.

TABLE GHG-1
PCAPCD GHG OPERATIONAL THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Residential (MT CO ₂ e/capita)		Non-Residential (MT CO ₂ e/1,000 sf)	
Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA, October 13, 2016.			

Projects that fall below the 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr threshold or meet the efficiency thresholds are considered to be in keeping with statewide GHG emissions reduction targets, which would ensure that the proposed project would not inhibit the State's achievement of GHG emissions reductions. Thus, projects which involve emissions below the 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr threshold or below the efficiency thresholds presented in the PCAPCD GHG Operational Thresholds of Significance table above are considered to result in less-than-significant impacts in regards GHG emissions within the District and would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Finally, the PCAPCD has also established a Bright Line Cap, which shall be the maximum limit for any proposed project. The Bright Line Cap is 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr for all types of projects.

Significance Conclusions:

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment – *Less than Significant*; and**
- b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases – *Less Than Significant Impact*.**

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. Because the proposed project involves increased vehicle use in the area, the GHG emissions related to increased vehicle use in the area must be analyzed. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MTCO₂e), based on the global warming potential of the individual pollutants.

Similar to criteria air pollutants, the PCAPCD has identified the approximate size of a project for selected land use categories that would result in operational GHG emissions equal to the bright-line threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr and the screening level threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr based on CalEEMod modeling. Thus, if a project is equal to or less than the size identified by the PCAPCD, the project would not be expected to result in emissions of GHG in excess of the applicable thresholds of significance.

Short-term emissions of GHG associated with construction of the project are estimated at the highest to be 363 MTCO₂e/year for Phase 1 and 77 MTCO₂e/year for Phase 2, which are below the PCAPCD's Bright Line threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/year. Construction GHG emissions are a temporary release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change. Due to the size of the proposed project, the project's estimated construction-related GHG contribution to global climate change would be considered negligible on the overall global emissions scale.

The long-term operational GHG emissions estimate for the development project incorporates the project's potential area source and vehicle emissions, emissions associated with utility and water usage, and the generation of wastewater and solid waste. The annual GHG emissions associated with the project would be 3,860 MTCO₂e/year, which would be in excess of the de-minimis 1,100 MTCO₂e significance threshold. However, the project's operational GHG emissions would be below the PCAPCD's Bright Line Threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr and, therefore, the project must be evaluated against PCAPCD's efficiency thresholds.

As presented in the table above, the PCAPCD efficiency thresholds are broken down into residential or non-residential project types, and further broken down into urban or rural settings. Accordingly, the proposed project's operational GHG emissions per 1,000 square feet are compared to the efficiency threshold for an urban non-residential project type of 26.5 MTCO₂e/yr/1,000 sf. Based on the project's total square feet, the operational GHG emissions are estimated to be 18.5 MTCO₂e/yr/1,000 sf, which is below the applicable efficiency threshold.

Because the levels of construction emissions are below the 10,000 MTCO₂e/year significance threshold and the project's operational GHG emissions per 1,000 square feet is estimated to be below the urban non-residential efficiency threshold of 26.5 MTCO₂e/yr/1,000 sf, the project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target nor conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs and the impact of the project on global climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would be considered less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development and operation of a multi-department health center at this project site would result in construction and operational activities which will include associated potential hazards and hazardous materials.

As discussed below, compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies and applicable City Code and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations would reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated human health and hazards impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included wildland fire hazards, transportation, use and disposal of hazardous materials, and emergency response and evacuation plans (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011 pages 4.7-1 through 4.7-30). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the Rocklin General Plan can introduce a variety of human health and hazards impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of development standards in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding hazardous conditions, and compliance with local, state and federal standards related to hazards and hazardous materials.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for human health and hazards impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan and the City’s Improvement Standards, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

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

protection of persons and property in the event of fires, floods, storms, epidemic, riot, earthquake and other disasters.

Significance Conclusion:

a. and b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials – *Less than Significant Impact*. Construction, operation and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials, including fuels (gasoline and diesel), oils and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps and detergents), and fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and yard/landscaping equipment. While these products noted above may contain known hazardous materials, the volume of material would not create a significant hazard to the public through routine transport, use, or disposal and would not result in a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident condition involving the release of hazardous materials. Compliance with various Federal, State, and local laws and regulations (including but not limited to Titles 8 and 22 of the Code of California Regulations, Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code) addressing hazardous materials management and environmental protection would be required to ensure that there is not a significant hazardous materials impact associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the project.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school – *Less Than Significant Impact*. There is one existing school within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of the project site—the Maria Montessori Charter Academy located approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site, respectively. While projects of this nature might typically emit significant amounts of hazardous materials, substances, or waste or be involved in the transportation of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, there are existing rules and regulations, as indicated above, that address hazardous materials management and environmental protection. Therefore, there is a less-than-significant impact related to hazardous emissions or hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment – *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is not on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Government Code 65962.5 is known as the Cortese List, and identifies public drinking water wells with detectable levels of contamination, hazardous substance sites selected for remedial action, sites with known toxic material identified through the abandoned site assessment program, sites with Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) having a reportable release, and all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is known migration. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker databases were searched on March 20, 2024 and no open hazardous sites were identified on the project

site. Therefore, the impact related to a hazardous materials site on the project site would be less than significant.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not yet been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area – *No Impact*. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, there is no public or private airport hazard impact.

f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan – *Less than Significant Impact*. The City's existing street system, particularly arterial streets, provides emergency access from the project site. The project's layout and design would not impair or physically interfere with the street system emergency evacuation route or impede an emergency evacuation plan; therefore, a less than significant impact on emergency routes/plans would be anticipated.

g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires – *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is located in a mostly developed area, surrounded by recreational areas and light industrial, office and residential development. There are no site or project characteristics such as slope, prevailing winds, and other factors that would exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project patients and employees to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. As such, there is no potential for the spread of wildfires due to the site characteristics. Additionally, the project will be reviewed by the Rocklin Fire Department and has been designed with adequate emergency access for use by the Rocklin Fire Department to reduce the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
Would the project:					
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X		
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			X		
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X		
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite;			X		
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X		
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?			X		
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X		
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project would involve grading activities that would expose soil to wind and water erosion and potentially impact water quality. Waterways in the Rocklin area have the potential to flood and expose people or structures to flooding. Additional impervious surfaces would be created with the development of the proposed project.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated hydrology and water quality impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included water quality, ground water quality and supply, drainage, flooding, risks of seiche, tsunami and mudflow (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.9-1 through 4.9-37). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in hydrology and water quality impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of development standards contained in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications and in the Rocklin Municipal Code, the application of General Plan goals and policies related to hydrology, flooding and water quality, and compliance with local, state, and federal water quality standards and floodplain development requirements.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to, flood prevention and drainage requirements in the City’s Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications, the City’s Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance, the State Water Resources Control Board General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit requirements, and goals and policies in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation and Safety Elements requiring the protection of new and existing development from flood and drainage hazards, the prevention of storm drainage run-off in excess of pre-development levels, the development and application of erosion control plans and best management practices, the annexation of new development into existing drainage maintenance districts where warranted, and consultation with the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and other appropriate entities.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as well as relevant standards from the City’s Improvement Standards for hydrology and water quality impacts will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the Rocklin Municipal Code and other City rules and regulations.

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

The project would also be subject to the City's Flood Hazard Area Ordinance and City General Plan policies related to floodplain protection and encroachment; these tools are designed to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions by having legally enforceable regulations that are applied uniformly throughout the City to all publicly and privately owned land within flood prone or flood related erosion areas, they allow the City to protect regulatory floodplains from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants, and they ensure that regulatory floodplains, based on the most current information, are not adversely affected by new development, both upstream and downstream.

In addition, the project would be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications that are a part of the City's development review process.

Significance Conclusions:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality – *Less than Significant Impact*;**
- b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin – *Less than Significant Impact*;**

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan – *Less than Significant Impact*.

Storm water runoff from the project site will be collected in stormwater drainage pipes and then directed through water quality treatment devices/areas as Best Management Practices (BMP) and/or Low Impact Development (LID) features and then into the City's storm drain system. The purpose of the BMP/LID features is to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system. The purposes of the BMP/LID features are to ensure that potential pollutants are filtered out before they enter the storm drain system and to provide opportunities for groundwater recharge. The City's storm drain system maintains the necessary capacity to support the project site. Therefore, violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are not anticipated.

To address the potential for polluted water runoff during project construction, the project would be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan through the application of the City's Improvement Standards and Standard Specifications as a part of the City's development review process. The erosion and sediment control plan are reviewed against the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual and the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual. The erosion and sediment control plan includes the implementation of Best Management Practices/Best Available Technology (BMPs/BATs) to control construction site runoff. The project will also be required to comply with the City's Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.28), and the Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.30), which includes the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or a river.

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area because the City's policies of requiring new developments to detain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels (unless the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's Flood Control Manual requires otherwise) and to coordinate with other projects' master plans to ensure no adverse cumulative effects will be applied. Whether the project is located within the Dry Creek watershed or the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, the City's application of conditions of approval requiring a registered civil engineer to prepare a final drainage plan and study consistent with the City's policies will ensure that development will not increase stormwater runoff rates beyond pre-development levels. Per the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan, onsite stormwater detention is generally not recommended anywhere in the Dry Creek watershed because it has been determined that on-site detention would be detrimental to the overall watershed, unless existing downstream drainage facilities cannot handle post-construction runoff from the project site. Substantial erosion, siltation or flooding, on- or off-site,

and exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems would not be anticipated to occur.

Therefore, violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would not be anticipated to occur with the project, surface or groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded, and conflicts with or obstruction of a water quality control plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

The project will use domestic water from the Placer County Water Agency and not use wells or groundwater; therefore, existing groundwater resources will not be depleted. The project site itself is not a substantial recharge area because of its smaller size in comparison to the overall groundwater recharge area. The City's policies of requiring new developments to retain on-site drainage such that the rate of runoff flow is maintained at pre-development levels and implementation of Low Impact Development features will ensure that groundwater recharge rates are also maintained at pre-development levels. Therefore, groundwater quality would not be substantially degraded or supplies decreased and conflicts with, obstruction of, or impediment of a sustainable groundwater management plan would not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation – *Less Than Significant Impact.*

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps (Map Panel 06061C0933H, effective date November 2, 2018) the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and outside of the 500-year flood hazard area.

The City's Flood Hazard Area Ordinance and City General Plan policies are designed to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions by having legally enforceable regulations that are applied uniformly throughout the City to all publicly and privately-owned land within flood prone or flood related erosion areas. They allow the City to protect regulatory floodplains from encroachment by development that would impede flood flows or pose a hazard to occupants, and they ensure that regulatory floodplains, based on the most current information, are not adversely affected by new development, both upstream and downstream.

The project site is not located within the potential inundation area of any dam or levee failure, nor is the project site located sufficiently near any significant bodies of water or steep hillsides to be at risk from inundation by a tsunami or seiche. Therefore, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones and a less than significant impact would be anticipated.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
Would the project:						
a)	Physically divide an established community?				X	
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

Approval of the project would allow construction of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center on 13.1 acres. The project would include medical, dental, and optometry services as well as related administrative functions and a pharmacy. As discussed below, land use impacts are not anticipated.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on land use as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included dividing an established community and potential conflicts with established land uses within and adjacent to the City (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.1-1 through 4.1-38). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in land use impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding land use impacts.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to land use incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Physically divide an established community – *No Impact.*

The project site is currently vacant, and the entire project is within the City of Rocklin. The proposed construction of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there is no division of community impact.

b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The site's current General Plan designation is Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI). The site is zoned Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI). As proposed, the project is consistent with the General Plan designation and the zoning designation for the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with land use plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, no impact is anticipated because the project site does not contain known mineral resources.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state – *No Impact*; and

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan – *No Impact*.

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

XIII. NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?			X		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

As discussed below, development of the proposed project will result in an increase in short-term noise impacts from construction activities. Compliance with the mitigation measures incorporated into the General Plan goals and policies, and the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines⁴ would reduce construction noise related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of noise associated with the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included construction noise, traffic noise, operational noise, groundborne vibration, and overall increases in noise resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.5-1 through 4.5-48).

⁴ City of Rocklin, 2023. Construction Noise Guidelines. Accessed at: <https://www.rocklin.ca.us/construction-noise-guidelines>

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

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures in the form of revised goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Background Information on Noise

Noise is a subjective reaction to different types of sounds. Noise is typically defined as (airborne) sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected or undesired, and may therefore be classified as a more specific group of sounds. Perceptions of sounds and noise are highly subjective from person to person. The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environmental noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by A-weighted sound levels which focus on the wavelength frequency of sound levels experienced by humans. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as dBA) and the way the human ear perceives sound and for this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment.

Measuring sound directly would require a very large and awkward range of numbers, so to avoid this, the decibel (dB) scale was devised. The decibel scale is logarithmic, not linear. In other words, two sound levels 10 dB apart differ in acoustic energy by a factor of 10. When the standard logarithmic scale is A-weighted, an increase of 10 dBA is generally perceived as a doubling in

loudness. For example, a 70 dBA sound is half as loud as an 80 dBA sound, and twice as loud as a 60 dBA sound.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the ambient noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given environment. A common statistical tool is the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}). The L_{eq} is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor, L_{dn} , and shows very good correlation with community response to noise. The day/night average level (L_{dn}) is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10 dB weighting applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because L_{dn} represents a 24-hour average, it tends to deemphasize short-term variations in the noise environment.

The City of Rocklin General Plan includes criteria for stationary (non-transportation) and transportation noise sources. Because the proposed project is located within close proximity to West Stanford Ranch Road and other roadways, the discussion below focuses on whether roadway noise levels would exceed City of Rocklin exterior noise level standards at the hospital and nursing homes of the project. For transportation noise sources, the maximum allowable exterior noise level standard for outdoor activity areas is 60 dB Ldn.

Sensitive Receptors

Noise sensitive receptors include residences, schools, hospitals, churches and similar uses that are sensitive to noise. Sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the project site include Skibbereen Way Residences located approximately 120 feet to the south of the project boundary, the Villas at Stanford Ranch located approximately 150 feet to the southwest, and Goddard School of Rocklin located approximately 370 feet to the east.

Existing noise sources in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project are primarily vehicular traffic along West Stanford Ranch Road (south of the proposed project area), and Wildcat Boulevard (east of the proposed project area).

To quantify the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed project, a noise measurement survey was conducted on August 10-11, 2023 within the project area and near sensitive land uses that could be impacted by noise generated by the project (See **Figure 6 – Noise Monitoring Locations**). The noise measurement was conducted using calibrated Larson Davis LxT noise meter. The noise measurement survey consisted of two 15-minute short-term (ST) noise measurements and one 24-hour long-term (LT) noise measurement. Noise levels generally increase in the early morning corresponding with increases in commuter traffic and other activities. Monitored noise levels are presented in **Table NOI-1**.



SOURCE: ESRI, 2023; ESA, 2023

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 6
Noise Monitoring Locations

**Table NOI-1
Measured Ambient Noise Levels**

Monitor	Location	Start Time	Noise level (dBA)	Primary Noise Source(s)
ST-1	Entrance to The Goddard School of Rocklin	11:12 a.m.	54 L _{eq}	Traffic on Wildcat Boulevard
ST-2	North side of The Villas at Stanford Ranch on W Stanford Ranch Road Park Boulevard	10:41 a.m.	70 L _{eq}	Traffic on W Stanford Ranch Road
LT-1	Behind 1397 Skibbereen Way on W Stanford Ranch Road Park Boulevard	12:00 a.m.	67 L _{eq} ^a	Traffic on W Stanford Ranch Road
			61 L _{eq} ^b	
			69 L _{dn} ^c	
NOTES: Short-term = ST, long-term = LT. a Leq Daytime 7:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m. b Leq Nighttime 10:00 p.m. - 7:00 a.m. c Ldn: 10 dBA penalty for noise between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Source: ESA, 2023.				

Operational Noise

The project would generate operational noise from activities associated with the proposed medical office, dental clinic, and optometry facility activities as well as an increase in traffic along roadways in the project vicinity.

Commercial uses proposed as part of the project would generate operational noise primarily from vehicle activity to the site. In addition, Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) units would also generate noise. However, this noise would be minimal and would not be audible to the nearest receptors, the residents located to the south of the project site.

HVAC units can generate noise levels of approximately 51 dBA L_{eq} at a reference distance of 100 feet from the operating units during maximum heating or air conditioning operations.⁵ HVAC units are typically housed in equipment rooms or in exterior enclosures on the building's rooftop. The nearest existing sensitive land use is located approximately 300 feet south of the proposed project building where operational HVAC noise levels would be 42 dBA, Leq. This would be less than the City's daytime and nighttime exterior noise standards of 55 dBA and 45 dBA, respectively, from stationary sources from Table 2-1 of the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element.

Traffic Noise

As a part of the General Plan EIR, traffic data representing annual average traffic volumes for existing conditions were obtained from Caltrans and the General Plan EIR traffic consultant, DKS Associates. Using this data and the FHWA methodology, traffic noise levels as defined by Ldn were calculated for existing and future traffic volumes. Distances from the centerlines of selected roadways to the 60 and 65 dB Ldn contours are summarized in Table 4-11 and Table 4-12 of the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element. Table 4-12 shows the future traffic noise levels based

⁵ Puron, 2005. 48PG03-28 Product Data. p. 10 – 11.

upon the year 2030. The results of the analysis are based upon inputs to the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108). Traffic volumes used for this analysis were obtained from the General Plan EIR traffic analysis, and the potential noise impacts from traffic were evaluated based on Predicted 2030 Traffic Noise Levels from the City of Rocklin General Plan EIR noise analysis. The predicted noise levels were compared to noise level performance criteria for transportation noise sources contained within the City of Rocklin General Plan Noise Element.

It should be noted that Table 2-2 of the City of Rocklin Noise Element does not contain an “outdoor activity” area noise standard for office uses, and furthermore, the project does not propose any outdoor activity areas.

The project would also lead to an increase in operational noise from traffic generated by the proposed development. These trips would be distributed along the roadway network in the vicinity of the project site and would result in increase in noise levels along roadway segments and intersections leading to the project site.

**TABLE NOI-2
PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

Roadway Segment	Existing (A) (dBA)	Existing + Project (B)(dBA)	A-B (dBA)	Significance Threshold based on Existing Noise Level (dBA)	Noise Increase Significant?
W Stanford Ranch Rd from Sunset Blvd to Verifone Dwy/Oracle Dwy	71.8	72.3	0.5	3.0	No
W Stanford Ranch Rd from Verifone Dwy/Oracle Dwy to Wildcat Blvd	71.7	71.9	0.2	3.0	No
W Stanford Ranch Rd from Wildcat Blvd to W Oaks Blvd	69.1	69.3	0.2	3.0	No
Wildcat Blvd from W Stanford Ranch Rd to Fire Station Dwy	71.3	71.5	0.2	3.0	No
Wildcat Blvd from Fire Station Dwy to Iroquois Rd	71.3	71.6	0.3	3.0	No
Notes: 1. Noise levels were determined using the methodology described in FHWA Traffic Noise Model Technical Manual and project traffic data from Fehr and Peers. 2. P.M. peak hour traffic data used.					

The Project would be considered to generate a significant impact if it resulted in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels greater than 3 dBA above levels existing without the project for areas already impacted by noise. Traffic noise levels along segments of West Stanford Ranch Road, which would be most affected by project traffic, were determined using algorithms of the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model Technical Manual and evening peak hour turning movements in the traffic section⁶ for existing and existing plus project conditions. The segments analyzed and the modeled noise increases along these segments are shown in **Table NOI-2** above.

⁶ Because average daily traffic volumes and nighttime fraction data are not available for all the roadways analyzed, calculation of an Ldn value from available traffic volume data is speculative. This analysis uses peak hour Leq to determine the existing and with project traffic noise levels. Caltrans recognizes that the Ldn is typically approximately equal to the peak hour Leq (Caltrans, 2013).

Vibration Levels

Construction operations have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and operations involved. The ground vibration levels associated with various types of construction equipment are summarized in the table below.

TABLE NOI-3
REPRESENTATIVE VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

Equipment		Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)_	Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)_
Pile Driver (impact)	upper range	1.518	2.121
	typical	0.644	0.900
Pile Driver (sonic)	upper range	0.734	1.026
	typical	0.170	0.238
Vibratory Roller		0.210	0.293
Large Bulldozer		0.089	0.124
Loaded Trucks		0.076	0.106
Jackhammer		0.035	0.049
Small Bulldozer		0.003	0.004
Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006			
Note: Vibration levels at 20 feet were calculated using the equation provided by FTA that may be used to estimate vibration at different distances based on a reference ppv at 25 feet for various construction equipment.			

Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. The effects of ground vibration may be imperceptible at the lowest levels, low rumbling sounds and detectable vibrations at moderate levels, and slight damage to nearby structures at the highest levels.

At the highest levels of vibration, damage to structures is primarily architectural (e.g., loosening and cracking or plaster or stucco coatings) and rarely results in structural damage. For most structures, a peak particle velocity (ppv) threshold of 0.5 inch per second or less is sufficient to avoid structural damage. The Federal Transit Administration recommends a threshold of 0.5 ppv for residential and commercial structures, 0.25 ppv for historic buildings and archaeological sites, and 0.2 ppv for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The primary goal for the City of Rocklin General Plan with respect to noise is: “To protect City residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise”. To implement that goal, the City has adopted Noise Compatibility Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Noise Control. The objective of the Noise Compatibility Guidelines is to assure that consideration

is given to the sensitivity to noise of a proposed land use in relation to the noise environment in which it is proposed to be located.

Potential noise impacts can be categorized into short-term construction noise impacts and long-term or permanent noise impacts. The City has adopted standard conditions for project approvals which address short-term impacts. These include limiting traffic speeds to 25 mph and keeping equipment in clean and tuned condition. The project would be subject to these standard conditions. The project would also be subject to the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines, including restricting construction-related noise generating activities within or near residential areas to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends to the satisfaction of the City Engineer or Building Official. Therefore, impacts associated with substantial temporary increases in the ambient noise environment or generation of excessive groundborne noise levels during construction would be less than significant.

Construction and operation would not be expected to involve the use of any equipment or processes that would result in potentially significant levels of ground vibration. The closest structures to the project site are more than 100 feet from project construction. As shown in the Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment table above, the predicted vibration levels from vibratory rollers, bulldozers, loaded trucks and jackhammers at a distance of 20 feet would not exceed the 0.5 ppv threshold for residential and commercial structures. Therefore, the generation of excessive groundborne vibration is anticipated to be less than significant.

The nearest sensitive land use would not be exposed to noise generated by the onsite HVAC equipment that would exceed the City's daytime and nighttime exterior noise standards of 55 dBA and 45 dBA, respectively. Therefore, the impact from HVAC operations would be less than significant.

The highest increase in traffic noise at a sensitive land use (located adjacent to a roadway segment affected by the proposed project) is 0.5 dB, which is less than 3 dBA. Therefore, localized noise increases from the addition of project traffic would be less than significant.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels – *No Impact*.

The City of Rocklin, including the project site, is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport, and is therefore not subject to obtrusive aircraft noise related to airport operations. Therefore, there is no airport related noise impact.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project will result in the construction of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center, which would not induce substantial population growth or displace substantial numbers of people.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated population and housing impacts that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included population growth and availability of housing opportunities (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.11-1 through 4.11-13). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in population and housing impacts, implementation of the General Plan would not contribute to a significant generation of growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections nor would it displace substantial numbers of housing units or people. Moreover, the project will not construct off-site infrastructure that would induce substantial development, unplanned or otherwise. As such, population and housing impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The project site is currently designated on the City's General Plan land use map as Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (BP/COMM/LI). The project site is currently zoned as Planned Development Business Professional/Commercial/Light Industrial (PD-BP/C/LI). The proposed development of a comprehensive health center is consistent with both the General Plan land use designation and the zoning designation for the project site.

The development of a health center at this project site would not be considered to induce substantial unplanned population growth into the project area. There would be no residents introduced by the proposed project. Further, health center employees introduced by the proposed project would likely be Rocklin or other nearby residents. There would not be an increase in population to the project site resulting from the project, and the impact would be less than significant.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere – *Less Than Significant Impact*.

The development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center at this project site would result in construction activities which would result in an increase in workers at the project site. The project site is vacant and undeveloped. Therefore, the project would not displace people or existing housing. Although the development of a health center at this site would represent an increase in employees, it will not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere will not occur, and the impact would be less than significant.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Fire protection?			X		
b) Police protection?			X		
c) Schools?				X	
d) Parks?			X		
e) Other public facilities?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project would not create a significant impact related to the need for the provision of new and/or expanded public services or facilities.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for fire and police protection and school and recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for fire, police, and school services, provision of adequate fire flow, and increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-1 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in public services and facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with state and local standards related to the provision of public services and facilities and through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to public services and facilities.

These goals, policies and standards include, but are not limited to the California Fire Code, the California Health and Safety Code, Chapters 8.12 and 8.20 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, and

goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety and Public Services and Facilities Elements requiring studies of infrastructure and public facility needs, proportional share participation in the financial costs of public services and facilities, coordination of private development projects with public facilities and services needed to serve the project, maintaining inter-jurisdictional cooperation and coordination and requiring certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special needs to mitigate the demands/needs.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to public services incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for the project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

California Fire Code, the California Health and Safety Code, Chapters 8.12 and 8.20 of the Rocklin Municipal Code, and the goals and policies in the General Plan Community Safety, and Public Services and Facilities Elements requiring studies of infrastructure and public facility needs, coordination of private development project with public facilities and services needed to serve the project, maintaining inter-jurisdictional cooperation and coordination, and requiring certain types of development that may generate higher demand or special need to mitigate the demands/needs.

Significance Conclusions:

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire Protection – Less than Significant Impact.

The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, equipping and location of fire stations within the City of Rocklin. The closest fire station to the project site is Fire Station #25 on Wildcat Boulevard, which is approximately 200 feet east of the site. Development of the project would not change the population of the project area and would therefore not increase the need for fire protection services. Further, the city collects construction taxes for use in acquiring capital facilities such as fire suppression equipment. Operation and maintenance funding for fire suppression is provided through financing districts and from general fund sources. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure fire protection service to the site. The project site is located directly across the Wildcat Boulevard from a City of Rocklin Fire Station and would not

require the construction of a new fire station to serve the project. Therefore, project impacts related to fire protection would be less than significant.

b. Police Protection – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The development of this project site has been reviewed by the Rocklin Police Department in association with their efforts to plan, staff, and equip the police station and provide police services within the City of Rocklin. Development of the proposed project would not increase the need for police patrol and police services to the site. Funding for police services is primarily from the general fund and is provided as part of the city's budget process. The proposed project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure police protection services to the site and ensure police protection impacts would be less than significant.

c. Schools – *No Impact.*

The project will not include residential units, and therefore, would not generate demand for school services, impact existing schools, or be required to pay school impact fees.

d. Parks – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The development of this project site has been anticipated in the planning, staffing, and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City of Rocklin. Development of the project site could increase the use of nearby park and recreation facilities. Funding for park and recreation facilities development and maintenance is primarily from the development fees, the general fund and financing districts, and is provided for as part of the City's budget process. The project would pay construction taxes, participate in any applicable financing districts and contribute to the general fund through property and sales taxes. Participation in these funding mechanisms would ensure the construction and maintenance of park and recreation facilities and reduce impacts to parks to less than significant.

e. Other Public Facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The need for other public facilities such as libraries would not be anticipated to be created by the proposed project, and the impact is anticipated to be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed project, the development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center providing medical, dental, optometry services, related administrative functions, and pharmaceutical services, would be anticipated to increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities but not at a level that results in a significant impact.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on the demand for recreation facilities as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased demand for parks and recreation (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.12-30 through 4.12-45). The analysis found that, while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in recreation facilities impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to recreation facilities. The General Plan has established a parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 population and has adopted goals and policies to ensure that this standard is met. These goals and policies call for the provision of new park and recreational facilities as needed by new development through parkland dedication and the payment of park and recreation fees. These programs and practices are recognized in the General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, which mitigates these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for impacts to recreation incorporated as goals and policies in the Rocklin General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The proposed project, a comprehensive health center, is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of, and demand for, recreational facilities. The City of Rocklin provides parkland dedication and/or collection of park fees to mitigate for the increased recreational impacts of new residential developments at the time that a parcel or subdivision map is recorded or building permits are issued for multi-family units. As such, new residents introduced by residential development in the City will have adequate recreational facilities. However, the proposed project is a non-residential, healthcare development that would not increase the number of residents in the area. Users of the health center would likely be existing Rocklin residents who are already accounted for in the demand for parkland, or the users would be from outside of Rocklin where they would not generate additional demand for parkland within Rocklin.

The project includes access to City recreational facilities such as the adjacent Margaret Azevedo Park, but the use is anticipated to be minimal and is not anticipated to significantly increase the use of existing facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor is the minimal use anticipated to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts regarding the increase in use of recreational facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			X		
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X			

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center built out over two or more phases to provide medical, dental, optometry services, related administrative functions, and a pharmacy at this project site would result in construction activities and the operation of the health center which could result in transportation impacts because an undeveloped site will become developed, but not to a degree that would result in a substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on transportation that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included signalized intersections in Rocklin, Loomis, Roseville, Lincoln and Placer County, state/interstate highway segments and intersections, transit service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and conflicts with at-grade railways (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.4-1 through 4.4-98).

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

roundabouts where financially feasible and warranted to provide flexibility in controlling traffic movements at intersections.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan related to transportation incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for the project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Project-Level Environmental Analysis:

The firm of Fehr & Peers, with recognized expertise in transportation, prepared a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed project. Their report, dated June 17, 2024, is available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA. The report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. City staff has reviewed the documentation and is also aware that Fehr & Peers has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Fehr & Peers report, which informs the impacts discussion below.

Current Background Traffic Conditions

Vehicular access to the project site is provided via an access road off of Wildcat Boulevard on the northeast corner of the project site.

Regional access to the project is provided by State Route 65 (SR 65), which is a four-lane freeway within the study area. SR 65 has interchanges at Sunset Boulevard and Whitney Ranch Parkway to the north and south of the project site, respectively. The key local arterial and collector roadways in the study area are described below.

Wildcat Boulevard

Wildcat Boulevard is a north-south arterial that begins at West Stanford Ranch Road and continues to the Rocklin/Lincoln City limit where it becomes East Lincoln Parkway. This facility is currently four lanes and provides access to the newer Whitney Ranch development.

Stanford Ranch Road

Stanford Ranch Road is an arterial that extends from the SR 65/Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard interchange in a generally northern direction into Rocklin. Stanford Ranch Road has six lanes between the interchange and Sunset Boulevard, four lanes between Sunset Boulevard and Crest Drive, and six lanes between Crest Drive and West Oaks Boulevard. The road continues southwest from West Oaks Boulevard as West Stanford Ranch Road with six lanes, and then becomes Lonetree Boulevard past Sunset Boulevard.

Sunset Boulevard

Sunset Boulevard is an arterial roadway that travels from Foothills Boulevard North at its western terminus to Woodside Drive (just east of Pacific Street) at its eastern terminus. It features a full interchange with SR 65 approximately a half-mile north of the project site. Sunset Boulevard generally has three travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median, except around the Atherton Road/ University Avenue intersection, where it has two travel lanes in each direction.

West Oaks Boulevard

West Oaks Boulevard is an arterial roadway that extends east from Lonetree Boulevard to Whitney Ranch Parkway in northwest Rocklin. West of Lonetree Boulevard, it is a two-lane roadway without a posted speed limit and terminates approximately 1,000 feet west of Lonetree Boulevard. East of Lonetree Boulevard, it has one travel lane in each direction separated by a center two-way left-turn lane.

Whitney Ranch Parkway

Whitney Ranch Parkway is an east-west arterial that is currently planned to connect State Route 65 on the west to Sierra College Boulevard (via Park Drive and Valley View Parkway) to the east. Portions of the facility have been built and portions have not yet been built. Whitney Ranch Parkway currently exists as a four-to-six lane roadway from west of Wildcat Boulevard to Painted Pony Lane and it will eventually be built as a six lane facility from SR 65 to West Oaks Boulevard and as a four lane facility from West Oaks Boulevard to Park Drive. It should be noted that an upgrade to the current SR 65 interchange will be built to provide access to Whitney Ranch Parkway and eventually to Placer Parkway.

Atherton Road

Atherton Road is a two-lane collector roadway that primarily travels through the Atherton Tech Center in northwest Rocklin. It winds through the business park campus connecting to Sunset Boulevard at the north and Lonetree Boulevard at the south.

Lonetree Boulevard

Lonetree Boulevard is a north-south arterial roadway that parallels SR 65 from Sunset Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard. Lonetree Boulevard has two travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median.

Blue Oaks Boulevard

Blue Oaks Boulevard is an east-west arterial roadway that extends west from Sunset Boulevard in Rocklin to west Roseville. It features a full interchange with SR 65 approximately one mile south of the project site. Within Rocklin, it has two travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised landscaped median.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities – *Less than Significant Impact.*

Transit

Placer County Transit's Lincoln-Sierra College route (i.e., Route 20) is the closest transit service to the project site and has stops located about one-quarter mile away on Sunset Boulevard. Bus pullouts (without shelters) are also situated on eastbound West Stanford Ranch Road east of Sunset Boulevard and east of Wildcat Boulevard/Chaffrey Drive. Along the project's southern frontage, a bus pullout is located on westbound West Stanford Ranch Road. None of these pullouts are currently used by existing fixed-route transit services.

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency's (PCTPA) *Rocklin Community Transit Study* and *Placer County Short Range Transit Plan* evaluated transit route alternatives that would use either a portion of West Stanford Ranch Road or Wildcat Boulevard. However, neither study recommended those routes for implementation. The proposed project creates a travel destination that is likely to increase transit demand. If Placer County Transit were to implement a route along West Stanford Ranch Road in the future, the project would not interfere with such a plan since the existing bus pullout on the project's southern frontage would be maintained with construction of the proposed project.

Bicycle Travel

Class II bike lanes exist along the project frontage on both West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard. These bike lanes would be maintained with the proposed project. Additionally, the project driveways would be designed and installed consistent with City of Rocklin standards and would not significantly disrupt or interfere with the existing bicycle facilities.

The Class II bike lanes on West Stanford Ranch Road connect to the City's proposed Northern Loop Trail (*City of Rocklin Parks and Trails Master Plan*), which would loop around the northwestern portion of the City utilizing existing Class II bike lanes and existing/proposed Class I (i.e., off-street) bike paths. On Wildcat Boulevard, the Class II bike lanes transition to a Class I bike path about a half-mile north of the project site. The bike path connects to existing or proposed bike facilities to the north. The proposed Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility would not preclude implementation of any planned bicycle facilities as identified in the *City of Rocklin Parks and Trails Master Plan*.

Pedestrian Travel

The project frontage currently has sidewalks along West Stanford Ranch Road and Wildcat Boulevard. Crosswalks with pedestrian heads and push buttons are provided at the adjacent West Stanford Ranch Road / Wildcat Boulevard intersection to facilitate pedestrian travel. These existing pedestrian facilities and features would be maintained with the proposed project. Additionally, the project driveways would be designed and installed consistent with City of Rocklin standards and would not significantly disrupt the existing pedestrian facilities.

The General Plan includes several policies related to improving bicycle and pedestrian safety (through methods such as signage, lighting, etc.) and requiring developments to construct sidewalks, walking paths, or hiking trails connecting various land uses. The Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility project would not conflict with these policies.

Given the above considerations, the proposed project's impacts related to conflicts with adopted programs, plans, ordinances or policies regarding transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

b. Conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) Conflict with Congestion Management Program – *Less Than Significant Impact*.

The considerations for assessing this impact are discussed in the following three sections.

2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) *Technical Advisory* identifies a potential approach which an agency could use as the basis for determining significant VMT transportation impacts. Specifically, OPR recommends consideration of whether the project is consistent with the applicable Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The guidance aligns with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), which requires that an EIR should discuss inconsistencies between the proposed project and the regional transportation plan. For the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) region, this plan consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

The project would construct the Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility within an area designated as an Established Community in the 2020 MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions through VMT reduction, and these efforts are primarily focused on urban areas, where investments in the roadway system and transit, bike and pedestrian infrastructure are built into the MTP/SCS to achieve identified air quality targets.

According to the MTP/SCS, Established Community areas are typically areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities. Many are characterized as "first tier", "inner ring", or mature subdivision communities. Local land use patterns aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some


established communities have bus service; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. The MTP/SCS assumes that over the next two decades, the region will attract roughly 168,000 new homes and 228,000 new jobs to infill areas in cities, suburbs and towns across the region. This is about 64 percent of new housing and 84 percent of the new jobs expected in the region by 2040.

Figures 3-10 and 3-11 of the 2020 MTP/SCS show the 2016 and the projected 2040 vehicle miles traveled per capita for the six-County SACOG region. The sub-region in which the center of the project site is located is shown as generating (in 2016) between 100% and 115% of the regional average VMT per capita, and in the future (2040) the sub-region in which the center of the project site is located would improve efficiency by generating between 50% and 85% of the regional average VMT per capita.

SACOG Work VMT Per Job

To support SB 743 implementation, SACOG developed a screening map specific to employment using outputs from the 2016 base year model run of the SACSIM travel demand model for the 2020 MTP/SCS. SACOG's Work VMT per Job map uses "HEX" geography, wherein average work VMT per job is calculated for each HEX by tallying all work VMTs generated by both internal and external workers traveling to the HEX to work and dividing by the total number of jobs in that HEX. SACOG has made updates to this map since 2020, as data has been updated.

The proposed project is an employment-generating project and the Work VMT per Job map is thus applicable. Based on the most current map, the project would be entirely located within a HEX that generates between 50% and 85% of the regional average work VMT per job. The HEX averages 16.77 work VMT per job, which is about 77% of the average work VMT per job of 21.85 (per the SACOG map) in the City of Rocklin (see **Figure 7**). This is reasonable given that bus service is available along Sunset Boulevard within one-quarter mile of the project site for potential employees to use and the project is near complementary residential neighborhoods in south Placer County, where health care providers and staff could live.



SOURCE: SACOG, 2022; ESA, 2023

Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic

Figure 7
Work VMT Screening

Chapa-De Indian Health Program (CDHP) Business Operations

Given the unique clientele expected at the proposed health care facility (i.e., mostly the American Indian community), project trip distribution was evaluated using anonymized ZIP code data for current patients and staff. The ZIP code data shows that current Chapa-De Indian Health patients travel to the Auburn campus from 464 different ZIP codes throughout the greater Sacramento region. Of the 27,827 data entries (i.e., patients) provided, approximately 12% travel from City of Rocklin and City of Roseville ZIP codes, 17% travel from Sacramento or Yolo Counties, and another 4% travel from Lincoln or areas to the north (e.g., Yuba City). Therefore, the proposed South Placer clinic's Rocklin location would likely provide a more convenient (i.e., closer) location for at least one-third of existing patients throughout the region.

Future employees at the South Placer Clinic would likely have similar trip distribution patterns to other medical clinics in the south Placer County area. As demonstrated in the SACOG Work VMT per Job map described above, the South Placer Clinic location has an average work VMT per job that is 77% of the city-wide average.

Furthermore, CDIHP has indicated that some existing CDIHP employees may move to the South Placer Clinic upon opening. Based on anonymized ZIP code data of current health care providers and staff at the Auburn campus, approximately 37% (i.e., 58) of the 158 employees live closer to the proposed Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Facility site in Rocklin than to their current work location. Thus, the proposed project would provide a closer option for a sizeable portion of employees that could transfer to the proposed Rocklin location.

Summary

The project would provide existing CDIHP patients an opportunity to receive medical care at a location closer to their place of residence. This would likely result in a net reduction in patient VMT since patients would be able to receive medical care at the facility most convenient (i.e., closest) to them.

SACOG's HEX maps show that the workplace VMT per job for the proposed clinic location would fall below the 85% percent threshold used to typically identify a significant VMT impact, as described in the OPR Technical Advisory. Additionally, the 2020 MTP/SCS shows that the center of the project site is in a sub-region that would generate between 50% and 85% of the regional average VMT per capita by 2040. Given these considerations, the project is expected to generate work VMT at a rate less than the significance threshold recommended by the OPR Technical Advisory.

Since patient VMT is likely to decrease and work VMT would be less than the recommended threshold of significance, this impact would be less than significant.

c. The Proposed Project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature that is inconsistent with applicable design standards – *Less than Significant Impact*.

As previously discussed, the project would construct three new driveways. Two driveways would be located on West Stanford Ranch Road, and one would be located on the project's frontage on Wildcat Boulevard. According to the site plan, the proposed new driveway entrances would have varying widths between about 28 feet and 35 feet, meaning that they would be wider than the minimum width of 25 feet required by the *City of Rocklin Improvement Standards* (2016). Additionally, a northbound left turn pocket to serve the proposed driveway on Wildcat Boulevard is already built.

Other than the new driveways described above, the project would not change the design of adjacent local roadways, including the Oracle driveway. Since the project's proposed driveways would be consistent with the City's design standards and the project would not result in a geometric design feature that is inconsistent with the City's design standards this impact would be less than significant.

d. The Proposed Project would not result in roadway and transportation facilities that impede access for emergency response vehicles – *Less than Significant With Mitigation*.

Project vehicle trips would access the proposed project via three driveways (three new), as described in Transportation Impact Assessment memo. The new driveways would be designed according to City standards in order to provide sufficient emergency access for each area within the project site.

The proposed project would not alter the roadway network other than by installing curb cuts for the proposed new driveways. Though the proposed project driveways would provide site access for emergency vehicles, there could be insufficient access at proposed Driveway A, which would cause spill of such vehicles into adjacent public roadways. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, which would install a traffic signal at this intersection as described below, would reduce potential impacts to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1, Traffic Signal Installation:

To the satisfaction of the City Engineer, install a traffic signal at Driveway A, approximately 450 feet north of the West Stanford Ranch Road/Wildcat Boulevard intersection opposite the existing City of Rocklin Fire Station 25 driveway. In the case of an emergency, the signal would provide preemption for the fire station approach, ensuring priority for emergency access vehicles so that they would not be blocked and spill back to public roadways.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION

Project Impacts:

The project site does not contain any resources that are listed with the California Register of Historical Resources or that have been determined by the lead agency to have significance to a California Native American Tribe. Based on AB-52 consultation with the United Auburn Indian Community, there is the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources, and as such they have recommended the incorporation of mitigation measures noted below.

Prior Environmental Analysis:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts that would occur to historical, cultural and paleontological resources within the Planning area as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included potential destruction or damage to any historical, cultural, and paleontological resources (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.8-1 through 4.8-21). Mitigation measures to address these impacts are incorporated into the General Plan in the Land Use and Open Space, Recreation and Conservation Elements, and include goals and policies that encourage the preservation and protection of historical, cultural and

paleontological resources and the proper treatment and handling of such resources when they are discovered.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

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

All applicable mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, including the mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) – *Less Than Significant Impact*, or**
- ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. –*Less Than Significant Impact*.**

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52, Gatto 2014), as of July 1, 2015 Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3 require public agencies to consult with the Native American Heritage

Commission (NAHC) and Native American tribes for the purpose of mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources; that consultation process is described in part below:

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

As of the writing of this document, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), the Lone Band of Miwok Indians (IBMI), the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (SSBMI) and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (TMDCI) are the only tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area that have requested notification. Consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 (d) and per AB-52, the City of Rocklin provided formal notification of the project and the opportunity to consult on it to the designated contacts of the UAIC, IBMI, SSBMI and TMDCI in a letter dated December 20, 2023, and received by those organizations on December 28, 2023, December 27, 2023, January 2, 2024, and December 28, 2023, respectively. All four tribes had 30 days to request consultation on the project pursuant to AB-52. The SSBMI indicated they were not aware of any known cultural resources on the site but would like continued consultation through updates, as the project progresses. No responses were received from the TMDCI and the IBMI tribes, therefore AB-52 consultation with those tribes is considered to be complete for this project.

As part of the AB-52 consultation process, the UAIC requested a site visit which was conducted on March 28, 2024 and following that, they requested that the below mitigation measures be applied to the project.

To address the project's potential impact on tribal cultural resources, the following mitigation measures, agreed to by the applicant, are being applied to the project:

Mitigation Measure TCR-1, Unanticipated Discovery:

If any suspected TCRs. Including but not limited to cultural features, midden/cultural soils, artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), shell, bone, shaped stones, or ash/charcoal are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within

the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archaeologist.

A Tribal Representative and Lead Agency shall be immediately notified, and the Tribal Representative in coordination with the Lead Agency shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the City to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no further disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2, Tribal Monitoring:

The project proponent or their construction contractor shall comply with the following measure to assist with identification and treatment of TCRs at the earliest possible time during project-related earthmoving activities:

- *The project proponent shall contact the UAIC at least 2 weeks prior to project ground-disturbing activities to retain the services of a Tribal Monitor(s). The duration of the construction schedule and Tribal Monitoring shall be determined at this time.*
- *A contracted Tribal Monitor(s) shall monitor the vegetation grubbing, stripping, grading, trenching, and other agreed-upon ground-disturbing activities in the project area. All ground-disturbing activities shall be subject to Tribal Monitoring unless otherwise determined unnecessary by the UAIC.*
- *Tribal Monitors or Tribal Representatives shall have the authority to direct that work be temporarily paused, diverted, or slowed within 100 feet of the immediate impact area if sites or objects of potential significance are identified. The temporary pause/diversion shall be of an adequate duration for the Tribal Representative to examine the resource.*
- *Appropriate treatment of TCRs may include but is not limited to:*
 - *Recordation of the resource(s)*
 - *Avoidance and preservation of the resource(s)*
 - *Reburial of the resource(s) onsite in a designated area subject to no future disturbance. The location of the reburial shall be acceptable to the UAIC.*
- *To track the implementation of this measure, the Tribal Monitor(s) shall document field-monitoring activities on a Tribal Monitor log.*

- *The Tribal Monitor(s) shall wear the appropriate safety equipment while on the construction site and adhere to construction safety procedures and protocols.*
- *The Tribal Monitor, in consultation with the UAIC THPO and the City shall determine and end or reduction to the onsite monitoring if/when construction activities have a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.*
- *At no time, regardless of the presence or absence of a tribal monitor, shall suspected TCRs be mishandled or disrespected.*
- *The City shall assist with resolution of disagreements between the project proponent/contractor and the Tribe if such occurs on the project.*

Mitigation Measure TCR-3, Cultural Awareness Training:

- *The lead agency shall require the applicant/Contractor to provide a tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers, at their own expense. The WEAP shall be developed in coordination with interested Native American Tribes.*
- *The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values. The training may be done in coordination with the project archaeologist.*
- *All ground-disturbing equipment operators shall be required to receive the training and sign a form that acknowledges receipt of the training.*
- *These mitigation measures shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.*

The applicant is agreeable to the above mitigation measure; implementation of the above measure will limit impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X		
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The proposed development of an approximately 97,000-square-foot health center will increase the need for utility and service systems, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the utility and service providers to adequately provide such services.

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts on utilities and service systems that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included increased generation of wastewater flow, provision of adequate wastewater treatment, increased demand for solid waste disposal, and increased demand for energy and communication services (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-34). The analysis found that, while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in utilities and service system impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to utilities and service systems.

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

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on utility and service systems incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The proposed project site is located within the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) service area for sewer. SPMUD has a System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan, which is periodically updated to provide sewer to projects located within their service boundary. The plan includes future expansion as necessary. SPMUD collects participation fees to finance the maintenance and expansion of its facilities. The proposed project is responsible for complying with all requirements of SPMUD, including compliance with wastewater treatment standards established by the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board. The South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) was created by the City of Roseville, Placer County and SPMUD to provide

regional wastewater and recycled water facilities in southwestern Placer County. The regional facilities overseen by the SPWA include the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants, both of which receive flows from SPMUD (and likewise from Rocklin). To project future regional wastewater needs, the SPWA prepared the South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Evaluation) in June 2007. The Evaluation indicates that as of June 2004, flows to both the wastewater treatment plants were below design flows. Both wastewater treatment plants are permitted discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Specifically, the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is permitted to discharge an average dry weather flow not to exceed 18 mgd, while the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant is permitted to discharge an average dry weather flow not to exceed 12 mgd. According to SPMUD, in 2016 the Dry Creek WWTP had an average dry weather inflow of 8.2 mgd, with SPMUD's portion being 1.8 mgd, and the Pleasant Grove WWTP had an average dry weather inflow of 7.0 mgd, with SPMUD's portion being 1.9 mgd. Consequently, both plants are well within their operating capacities and there remains adequate capacity to accommodate the projected wastewater flows from this project. Therefore, a less than significant wastewater treatment impact is anticipated.

The proposed project site is located within an area of the City of Rocklin that has been contemplated for urban development in the Rocklin General Plan, and as such the provision of storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas and telecommunications facilities to the project site has been planned for, with much of the necessary distribution infrastructure already in place within existing public utility rights-of-way. The City of Rocklin coordinates with utility and service providers as new development or re-development is being proposed.

The proposed project would be conditioned to require connection into the City's storm drain system, with Best Management Practices and/or Low Impact Development features located within the project's drainage system at a point prior to where the project site runoff will enter the City's storm drain system. Other than on-site improvements, new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required as a result of this project.

The project site is within the Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) service area for electric power and natural gas, and as new development occurs, PG&E builds infrastructure on an as needed basis. Upgrades to existing infrastructure within existing easements (such as roadway right-of-way) are not anticipated to result in significant environmental effects because existing rights-of-way are typically paved or otherwise modified from their original natural condition and would not contain sensitive environmental resources. New infrastructure, if required in previously undisturbed areas, would be addressed as part of the environmental review for the development of a specific site/project, or would be subject to separate environmental review.

The project site is within the service area for AT&T, CCI Communications, Wave Broadband and various wireless service telecommunications providers. Infrastructure for telephone and cable services is typically installed at the point of initial development and in accordance with service demand. Similar to electric power and natural gas, upgrades to existing telecommunications infrastructure within existing easements (such as roadway right-of-way) are not anticipated to

result in significant environmental effects because existing rights-of-way are typically paved or otherwise modified from their original natural condition and would not contain sensitive environmental resources. New infrastructure, if required in previously undisturbed areas, would be addressed as part of the environmental review for the development of a specific site/project, or would be subject to separate environmental review.

Therefore, the project is not anticipated to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects and the impact is less than significant.

b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years – *Less than Significant Impact*.

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

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

PCWA has planned for growth in the City of Rocklin and sized the water supply infrastructure to meet this growth and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years (PCWA 2006). The project site would be served by the Foothill WWTP, which treats water diverted from the American River Pump Station near Auburn, and the proposed project's estimated maximum daily water treatment demands would not exceed the plant's permitted capacity. Because the proposed project would be served by a water treatment plant that has adequate capacity to meet the project's projected demand and would not require the construction of a new water treatment plant, the project's water supply and treatment facility impacts would be considered less than significant.

d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The Western Regional landfill, which serves the Rocklin area, has a proposed permitted total capacity of 86.5 million cubic yards, and the estimated closure year for the landfill is

approximately 2110 (Western Placer Waste Management Agency, Waste Action Plan). Development of the project site with urban land uses was included in the lifespan and capacity calculations of the landfill, and a less-than-significant landfill capacity impact would be anticipated. Federal and State regulations regarding solid waste consist of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations and the California Integrated Waste Management Act regulating waste reduction. These regulations primarily affect local agencies and other agencies such as the Landfill Authority. The project will comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations regarding trash and waste and other nuisance-related issues as may be applicable. Recology would provide garbage collection services to the project site, provided their access requirements are met.

The project is not expected to include any unusual elements that would generate solid waste in excess of State and local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and the project would comply with solid waste regulations and the impact would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Impact for which General Plan EIR is Sufficient
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X		
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X		
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X		

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The development of a health center providing medical, dental, optometry services, related administrative functions, and a pharmacy at this project site would result in construction activities and the occupation of the health center which is expected to increase the need for fire and emergency responses to the project site, but not to an extent that will impact the ability of the fire and emergency responders to adequately provide such services.

The project is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA). There are no locations in Rocklin that are classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.

Prior Environmental Review:

As a “program EIR” under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, the General Plan EIR analyzed the anticipated impacts of wildland fires that would occur as a result of the future urban development that was contemplated by the General Plan. These impacts included exposure of

people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, impairment or interference with implementation of emergency response and evacuation plans and cumulative hazard impacts (City of Rocklin General Plan Update Draft EIR, 2011, pages 4.7-20 through 4.7-28). The analysis found that while development and buildout of the General Plan can result in wildland fire and emergency response impacts, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of General Plan goals and policies that would assist in minimizing or avoiding impacts to utilities and service systems.

These goals and policies include, but are not limited to, maintaining emergency operations plans, coordination with emergency management agencies, annexation into financing districts for fire prevention/suppression and emergency response, incorporation of fuel modification/fire hazard reduction planning, and maintaining interjurisdictional cooperation and coordination.

Mitigation Measures from Uniformly Applied Development Policies and Standards:

All applicable policies and standards, including the mitigation measures addressing impacts of urban development under the General Plan on wildland fire and emergency response incorporated as goals and policies in the General Plan, will be applied to the project. These serve as uniformly applied development policies and standards and/or as conditions of approval for this project to ensure consistency with the General Plan and compliance with City rules and regulations.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan – *Less than Significant Impact.*

The project occurs on a project site that is contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project site does not include any features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The streets adjacent to the project site serve as emergency evacuation corridors and would provide direct fire vehicle access to the site. In addition, the project will be evaluated by representatives of the City of Rocklin's Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Emergency circulation is provided throughout the site, and fire lane signage will facilitate such access. Most wildland fires are caused by human activities involving motor vehicles, construction/maintenance equipment, arson and burning of debris. The addition of impervious surface cover on the vacant project site may in fact help reduce the potential fire risk. Therefore, the project will not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan and the impact will be less than significant.

b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire – *Less than Significant Impact*; and

c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The project occurs on a site that is contemplated in the Rocklin General Plan for urban development, and the development of the project site does not occur in an area where an exacerbation of fire risk would occur due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The project will install new fire hydrants. In addition, construction of roadway improvements and other impervious surface areas, as well as upgrades to existing infrastructure would help reduce fire risk. Therefore, the project will not exacerbate wildfire risk and the impact will be less than significant.

d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes – *Less than Significant Impact*.

The project site is relatively flat and located in an urban area where there would be no downslope or downstream flooding or landslides that would result from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risks and the impact will be less than significant.

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

DISCUSSION OF DETERMINATION:

Project Impacts:

The preceding analysis demonstrates that these effects will not occur as a consequence of the project.

Significance Conclusions:

a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population

to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory – *Less than Significant with Mitigation.*

The proposed project site is partly surrounded by disturbed and developed land. Based on the project location and the application of mitigation measures for potential biological resources and cultural resources as discussed above, the proposed project does not have the potential to: substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Although the proposed project could cause a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because of the project design and the application of the recommended mitigation measures such as Mitigation Measures BIO-1, CUL-1, and TCR-1, TCR-2 and TCR-3 as well as the City's uniformly applied development policies and standards that will reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts with mitigation.

b. Does the project have impacts that are limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects) – *Less than Significant Impact.*

Development in the South Placer region as a whole will contribute to regional air pollutant emissions, thereby delaying attainment of Federal and State air quality standards, regardless of development activity in the City of Rocklin and application of mitigation measures. As a result of this potential degradation of the quality of the environment, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. The project-specific air quality analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impact. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will alter viewsheds as mixed urban development occurs on vacant land. In addition, new development will also generate new sources of light and glare; as a result, the General Plan EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative aesthetic impacts. Development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in cumulative, long-term impacts on biological resources (vegetation and wildlife), due to the introduction of domestic landscaping, homes, paved surfaces, and the relatively constant presence of people and pets, all of which negatively impact vegetation and wildlife habitat. As a result, the General

Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impacts, both at a project-specific Rocklin General Plan buildout level as it relates to biological resources solely within the City of Rocklin, as well as in the context of a cumulative contribution from Rocklin General Plan buildout as it relates to biological resources in the region. Development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same vacant land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Development in the City and the South Placer region as a whole will result in significant noise impacts as a result of the introduction of new noise sources and additional traffic and people. As a result, the General Plan EIR, which assumed the development of the proposed project site, determined that there would be significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impacts. The project-specific noise analysis discussed above demonstrated that the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative noise impact. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

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

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly – *Less than Significant Impact*.

Because the development of the proposed project represents conversion of the same land area that was analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly beyond those that were previously identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts.

Section 5. References

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2023. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). – Government version dated July 30, 2023, from <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/rarefind/view/RareFind.aspx>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire), 2023. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Available: <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008>.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2023. EnviroStor Database. Available: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.
- California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program, 2023. Rare Plant Inventory (online edition, v9.5). Website <https://www.rareplants.cnps.org>, Accessed on: August 9, 2023.
- California State Water Resources Control Board, 2023. GeoTracker Database. Available: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- City of Rocklin, 2011. General Plan Draft EIR. Available: <https://www.rocklin.ca.us/post/draft-general-plan-update-environmental-impact-report-0>.
- City of Rocklin, 2012. City of Rocklin General Plan. Available: <https://www.rocklin.ca.us/post/general-plan>.
- City of Rocklin, 2012. City of Rocklin General Plan. Circulation Element. October 2012. Available: https://www.rocklin.ca.us/sites/main/files/file-attachments/chapter_iv_c_circulation_element_0.pdf?1648508338.
- City of Rocklin, 2012. General Plan Final EIR. Available: <https://www.rocklin.ca.us/post/draft-general-plan-update-environmental-impact-report-0>.
- City of Rocklin, 2017. Parks and Trails Master Plan. February 14, 2017. Available: https://www.rocklin.ca.us/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rocklin_parks_and_trails_master_plan_final.pdf.
- City of Rocklin, 2023. Community Map. Available: <https://cityofrocklin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=58cc59c5e4f444ab89609ac0d662b635>. Accessed November 10, 2023.
- City of Rocklin Planning Division, 1974. Rocklin General Plan. Rocklin, CA. January 2012. City of Rocklin, CA. Updated 2021. <https://www.rocklin.ca.us/post/general-plan>

ESA, 2023. City of Rocklin Chapa-De Indian Health Clinic Project Biological Resources Technical Report. Prepared October 2023.

Fehr & Peers, 2023. Chapa-De Indian Health South Placer Clinic – CEQA Impact Assessment.

South Placer Municipal Utility District, 2023. Service Area Map. Available:
<https://spmud.ca.gov/service-area-map>.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2023. Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool. Accessed: August 2023. Available: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>.

TECHNICAL REPORTS:

The following technical reports will be made available for review during normal business hours at the City of Rocklin Planning Department, 3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA:

- **CalEEMod Output & Health Risk Assessment Calculations**
- **Biological Resources Technical Report**
- **Transportation Impact Analysis**
- **Site Access and Circulation Study**
- **Cultural Resources Study**

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
Air Quality				
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Use of Tier 4 Final Engines for Construction Equipment</p> <p><i>All diesel off-road equipment shall have engines that meet the Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards, as certified by CARB. This requirement shall be verified through submittal of an equipment inventory to the City of Rocklin prior to any construction activities that includes the following information: (1) Type of Equipment, (2) Engine Year and Age, (3) Number of Years Since Rebuild of Engine (if applicable), (4) Type of Fuel Used, (5) Engine HP, (6) Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS) information if applicable and other related equipment data. A Certification Statement is also required to be made by the Contractor for documentation of compliance and for future review by the air district as necessary. The Certification Statement must state that the Contractor agrees to compliance and acknowledges that a violation of this requirement shall constitute a breach of compliance.</i></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Applicant will submit a construction equipment inventory to the City of Rocklin. MM AQ-1 will be incorporated into the project plans. 	City staff will review equipment inventory, Certification Statement, and project plans to verify compliance with measure.	Prior to grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.
Biological Resources				

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites	Mitigation Measure BIO-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Nesting Birds: <i>If feasible, the applicant shall conduct all construction-related activities related to vegetation clearing, grading, or other ground disturbing activities during the non-breeding season (between August 16 and February 14) for migratory birds. If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the breeding season, a qualified avian biologist shall conduct a nesting survey within 15 days of the start of ground-disturbing or construction activities within the appropriate grassland habitat. If no nests are found during this survey, no further actions are required. If an active nest is found within the BSA, CDFW shall be consulted to determine an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active and the young have fledged.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If construction occurs during the non-breeding season, no actions are required. • If construction occurs during the breeding season, the project applicant will retain a qualified avian biologist who will conduct a nesting survey and prepare a survey memorandum. • If an active nest is found during nesting survey(s), the project applicant will coordinate with the City to consult with CDFW, and will comply with work buffer and timing requirements resulting from consultation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff will review the survey memorandum and monitor coordination with CDFW to verify compliance. 	Nesting survey will take place within 15 days of the start of ground-disturbing or construction activities.
Cultural Resources				

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources:</p> <p><i>If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) or tribal cultural resources is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist, the Environmental Coordinator and the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or a tribal cultural resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources would include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts and tribal cultural resources.</i></p>	<p>If cultural materials are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction. The project applicant will retain a qualified professional archaeologist, who will assess the cultural materials, determine their potential significance, and develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource(s) or mitigate impacts to the resource(s); The project applicant will notify the Environmental Coordinator; The project applicant will notify the Native American Heritage Commission; The project applicant will comply with all measures developed by the archaeologist. <p>If human remains are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction, immediately notify the Placer County coroner, and implement requirements identified in consultation with the County coroner, tribal representatives, as applicable. <p>MM CUL-1 will be incorporated into the project plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon notification of the discovery of cultural or human remains, City staff will participate in and monitor process and compliance of subsequent requirements identified through implementation of MM CUL-1. City staff will review project plans to verify inclusion of MM CUL-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of MM CUL-1 will be verified prior to grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities. MM CUL-1 will be implemented, as needed, throughout the construction period.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
	<p><i>In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Sections 15064.5 (e) (1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The City's Environmental Coordinator shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB2641 (2006).</i></p> <p><i>This mitigation measure shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.</i></p>			

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries	Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources.	<p>If cultural materials are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction. The project applicant will retain a qualified professional archaeologist, who will assess the cultural materials, determine their potential significance, and develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource(s) or mitigate impacts to the resource(s); The project applicant will notify the Environmental Coordinator; The project applicant will notify the Native American Heritage Commission; The project applicant will comply with all measures developed by the archaeologist. <p>If human remains are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction, immediately notify the Placer County coroner, and implement requirements identified in consultation with the County coroner, tribal representatives, as applicable. <p>MM CUL-1 will be incorporated into the project plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon notification of the discovery of cultural or human remains, City staff will participate in and monitor process and compliance of subsequent requirements identified through implementation of MM CUL-1. City staff will review project plans to verify inclusion of MM CUL-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of MM CUL-1 will be verified prior to grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities. MM CUL-1 will be implemented, as needed, throughout the construction period.
Transportation				
(d) The Proposed Project would not result in roadway and transportation facilities that impede access for emergency response vehicles	<p>Mitigation Measure TRA-1, Traffic Signal Installation:</p> <p><i>To the satisfaction of the City Engineer, install a traffic signal at Driveway A, approximately 450 feet north of the West Stanford Ranch Road/Wildcat Boulevard intersection opposite the existing City of Rocklin Fire Station 25 driveway. In the case of an emergency, the signal would provide preemption for the fire station approach, ensuring priority for emergency access vehicles so that they would not be blocked and spill back to public roadways.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant will design and construct the traffic signal as specified in MM TRA-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff will review and condition designs and coordinate construction of work within City right of way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The signal will be installed prior to commencement of project operations.
Tribal Cultural Resources				

<p>a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) – Less Than Significant Impact, or</p> <p>ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TCR-1, Unanticipated Discovery:</p> <p><i>If any suspected TCRs. Including but not limited to cultural features, midden/cultural soils, artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), shell, bone, shaped stones, or ash/charcoal are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archaeologist.</i></p> <p><i>A Tribal Representative and Lead Agency shall be immediately notified, and the Tribal Representative in coordination with the Lead Agency shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.</i></p> <p><i>The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the City to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no further disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.</i></p>	<p>If suspected TCRs are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction within the appropriate work area buffer as identified in TCR-1. • The project applicant will retain a qualified professional archaeologist, who will assess the cultural materials, determine their potential significance, and develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource(s) or mitigate impacts to the resource(s); • The project applicant will notify the Environmental Coordinator; • The project applicant will notify the Tribal Representative; • The project applicant will comply with all measures developed in consultation with the City and Tribal Representative. <p>If human remains are discovered during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project applicant or its contractors will halt construction, immediately notify the Placer County coroner, and implement requirements identified in consultation with the County coroner, tribal representatives, as applicable. <p>MM TCR-1 will be incorporated into the project plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon notification of the discovery of cultural or human remains, City staff will participate in and monitor process and compliance of subsequent requirements identified through implementation of MM TCR-1. • City staff will review project plans to verify inclusion of MM TCR-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of MM TCR-1 will be verified prior to grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities. • MM TCR-1 will be implemented, as needed, throughout the construction period.
--	--	---	---	---

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. <i>–Less Than Significant Impact.</i>				

	<p>Mitigation Measure TCR-2, Tribal Monitoring: <i>The project proponent or their construction contractor shall comply with the following measure to assist with identification and treatment of TCRs at the earliest possible time during project-related earthmoving activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The project proponent shall contact the UAIC at least 2 weeks prior to project ground-disturbing activities to retain the services of a Tribal Monitor(s). The duration of the construction schedule and Tribal Monitoring shall be determined at this time.</i> • <i>A contracted Tribal Monitor(s) shall monitor the vegetation grubbing, stripping, grading, trenching, and other agreed-upon ground-disturbing activities in the project area. All ground-disturbing activities shall be subject to Tribal Monitoring unless otherwise determined unnecessary by the UAIC.</i> • <i>Tribal Monitors or Tribal Representatives shall have the authority to direct that work be temporarily paused, diverted, or slowed within 100 feet of the immediate impact area if sites or objects of potential significance are identified. The temporary pause/diversion shall be of an adequate duration for the Tribal Representative to examine the resource.</i> • <i>Appropriate treatment of TCRs may include but is not limited to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Recordation of the resource(s)</i> ○ <i>Avoidance and preservation of the resource(s)</i> ○ <i>Reburial of the resource(s) onsite in a designated area subject to no future disturbance. The location of the reburial shall be acceptable to the UAIC.</i> • <i>To track the implementation of this measure, the Tribal Monitor(s) shall document field-monitoring activities on a Tribal Monitor log.</i> • <i>The Tribal Monitor(s) shall wear the appropriate safety equipment while on the construction site and adhere to construction safety procedures and protocols.</i> • <i>The Tribal Monitor, in consultation with the UAIC THPO and the City shall determine and</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project applicant will retain a qualified tribal monitor identified by UAIC, who will conduct monitoring during ground-disturbing construction activities. • Project applicant will require its contractors to provide the authority to the tribal monitor to direct work to be temporarily paused, diverted, or slowed in the instance of inadvertent discovery of potential TCRs. • The tribal monitor will direct the project applicant regarding the appropriate treatment of resources identified during construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will monitor project construction for compliance with MM TCR-2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant will coordinate the identification of a tribal monitor no less than two weeks prior to start of construction. • Compliance with MM TCR-2 will be required throughout ground-disturbing construction activity.
--	--	---	--	--

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring/Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Timing
	<p><i>end or reduction to the onsite monitoring if/when construction activities have a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>At no time, regardless of the presence or absence of a tribal monitor, shall suspected TCRs be mishandled or disrespected.</i>• <i>The City shall assist with resolution of disagreements between the project proponent/contractor and the Tribe if such occurs on the project.</i>			

	<p>Mitigation Measure TCR-3, Cultural Awareness Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The lead agency shall require the applicant/Contractor to provide a tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers, at their own expense. The WEAP shall be developed in coordination with interested Native American Tribes.</i> • <i>The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values. The training may be done in coordination with the project archaeologist.</i> • <i>All ground-disturbing equipment operators shall be required to receive the training and sign a form that acknowledges receipt of the training.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These mitigation measures shall be incorporated as notes on the project's grading and/or Improvement Plans and shall be implemented prior to any grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project applicant will prepare and deliver the WEAP; • The project applicant will provide the WEAP to interested native American tribes for review and comment; • The project applicant will deliver the WEAP training to all ground-disturbing equipment operators and record program participation. • The project applicant will provide program participation records to the City for review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff will review program participation records to verify compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to grading or ground/vegetation-disturbing activities.
--	---	---	--	--

