

---

---

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

---

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

---

This summary chapter provides an overview of the Sierra College Center project and the conclusions of the technical environmental analysis. This chapter also summarizes the alternatives to the proposed project. Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental effects of the proposed project identified in each technical section of Chapter 4. The table consists of the environmental impacts, the significance of each impact, the proposed mitigation measures, and the significance of each impact after the mitigation measures are implemented.

### **SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

#### **Project Location**

The City of Rocklin is approximately 25 miles northeast of the state capital, Sacramento, and is within the County of Placer (See Figure 3-1, Regional Location Map). Surrounding jurisdictions include: Placer County to the north and northeast, the Town of Loomis to the east and northeast, and the City of Roseville to the south and southwest. The Sierra College Center project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Rocklin Road and Sierra College Boulevard on a 9.83-acre site, which is in the City of Rocklin. The property is located in the transition of the central valley and the Sierra Nevada foothills at elevations between 320 feet and 340 feet.

Surrounding land uses include Sierra College to the northwest, commercial retail to the west, and residential housing to the east and south. The parcel immediately north is open disturbed grassland, but is designated for eventual development (See Figure 3-2, Project Location).

#### **Project Components**

The proposed project site includes the building of thirteen single story buildings, eleven of which are proposed as office buildings and two of which are proposed as retail buildings. The office buildings would total approximately 59,218 s.f. and the retail buildings would total approximately 18,370 s.f. of floor space for an overall total of 77,588 s.f. of floor space on approximately 9.83 acres. The main use of the office space is projected to be dental/medical with a mix of other small business.

### **SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

---

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the areas

affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. For these areas, this Draft EIR discusses the mitigation measures that could be implemented by the City of Rocklin to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less-than-significant. An impact that remains significant after mitigation is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of the proposed project. The mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR will form the basis of the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

This Draft EIR analyzed the following impacts for the proposed project:

### **Biological Resources**

This section describes existing biological resources on the project site, including wetlands, grasslands, and oak trees. Potential impacts to the existing biological conditions are discussed and assessed, including the quantification of potential tree removal on the project site, and mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential impacts.

The EIR found that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to special status plant species and the California red-legged frog. However, the EIR concluded that the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts regarding the following: loss of native oak trees, loss of wetland habitat, loss of riparian woodland, impacts to western pond turtles during construction, impacts to Cooper's hawks, impacts to nesting raptors, and cumulative impacts on biological resources. All potentially significant impacts include mitigation, which would reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, the EIR found that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to loss of foothill woodland habitat as no feasible mitigation exists to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

### **Transportation and Circulation**

Circulation of vehicular traffic is discussed in this section with regard to anticipated increases in personal transportation on both existing and proposed roadways, as well as emergency and utility access to the project site. Cumulative traffic information is also analyzed. Potential impacts to the existing traffic conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project are assessed, including the Level of Service (LOS) at nearby intersections as well as impacts to parking and safety issues related to design features.

The EIR found that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant traffic impacts. Traffic impacts discussed in this chapter include: impacts to intersections in the vicinity of the project site under existing and near-term conditions and increased demand for bicycle and transit services.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

An analysis of the cumulative impacts of the proposed project is undertaken and discussed at the end of each subchapter of the EIR in accordance with section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, all of the cumulative impacts generated by the proposed project are summarized in Chapter 5 of the EIR.

Cumulative impacts created by implementation of the proposed project were found to be less-than-significant in the areas of biological resources and transportation and circulation. (See Section V, Statutorily Required Section, for a summary of each cumulative impact).

## **SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

---

The following summary describes the alternatives to the proposed project that are evaluated for environmental impacts in this Draft EIR. A complete discussion of project alternatives is provided in Chapter 6, Alternatives Analysis.

### **No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative would allow the project site to continue in its existing vacant state. Under this alternative, the City of Rocklin would not approve development for the project site. This non-development alternative is characterized primarily by the benefits of continued natural space in the existing Sierra College Center project area. The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives.

### **Reduced Intensity Alternative**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would remove buildings H, I, J, and K from the proposed project plan. By eliminating these four buildings, the total office square footage for the proposed project would be reduced by 25,448 square feet, leaving a total square footage remaining of 52,140 square feet.

### **Reduced Building Footprint Alternative**

The Reduced Building Footprint Alternative would include approximately the same square footage as the proposed Sierra College Center project development; however the buildings would contain two stories instead of one. Buildings E through K would be removed and Buildings 1 and 2, as well as Buildings A through D would contain two stories. The resulting square footage would be 78,744 (39,372 x 2). The lot coverage for the buildings would be cut in half; however the same number of parking spaces would be required.

### **Increased Intensity Alternative**

The Increased Intensity Alternative would have a similar building footprint as the Reduced Building Footprint discussed above. However, the buildings would be increased to three stories. The resulting square footage would be 118,116 square feet (39,372 x 3). Adequate parking would need to be provided.

### **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Designating a superior alternative depends largely upon which environmental effects one considers most important. Other factors of importance include urban design, economics, social factors, and fiscal considerations. Of the alternatives analyzed, the Reduced Intensity Alternative provides the greatest reduction in the level of environmental impacts while meeting most of the overall objectives of the project. The reduction in number of site structures would reduce impacts to biological resources and traffic and circulation by significantly reducing the amount of grading and removal of trees for the project site, in addition to reducing the overall number of trips per day to the project area. While the Reduced Intensity Alternative does reduce the amount of square footage available for the proposed project site buildings, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would still generally meet the objectives of the proposed project to provide retail, office, and adequate parking space for the project site. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
<b>4.2 Biological Resources</b>			
4.2I-1 Construction-related Impacts to Riparian and Seasonal Wetland Habitat.	PS	<p>4.2MM-1(a) <i>Impacts to the wetlands and to the unnamed tributary to Secret Ravine Creek may be avoided through project design changes, thus negating the need for Section 404 or 1603 compliance. However, if impacts to the wetlands and unnamed tributary to Secret Ravine Creek cannot be avoided, mitigation measure 4.2MM-1(b) or mitigation measure 4.2MM-1(c) below, shall be implemented:</i></p> <p>4.2MM-1(b) <i>Prior to any grading or construction activity, the City shall require the developer to submit an application to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) to obtain water quality certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for the construction of the proposed project. Any certification conditions imposed by the CVRWQCB shall be complied with.</i></p> <p><i>Per the Army Corps letter dated February 15, 2006, in addition to conditions under Nationwide Permit # 39 and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, the following measures shall also be implemented:</i></p>	LS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To mitigate for the loss of 0.02 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.007 acres of intermittent drainage, the project applicant shall submit payment to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) (current amount is \$2,900.). Additionally, prior to proceeding with any activity authorized by Permit # 39, the project applicant must receive written notification from the Corps that the check has been deposited in NFWF's South Pacific Wetlands Account.</i></li> <li>• <i>A biologist who is familiar with seasonal wetlands and intermittent drainage shall monitor all construction activities within 250 feet of the avoided water of the United States during any grading activities. The monitor shall ensure no unauthorized activities occur within avoided waters during project implementation.</i></li> <li>• <i>To document pre- and post-project construction activities, the project applicant shall submit pre-construction photos of the project site prior to implementation and post-construction photos of the project site within 30 days of project completion.</i></li> <li>• <i>The project applicant shall design and construct all crossings of waters of the United States to retain a natural substrate and to accommodate all</i></li> </ul>	

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>reasonably foreseeable wildlife passage and expected high flows. Specific detailed plans for these crossings shall be submitted to and approved by the Corps of Engineers prior to implementation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The project applicant must allow representatives from the Corps of Engineers to inspect the authorized activity and any mitigation, preservation, or avoidance areas at any time deemed necessary to ensure that it is being or has been accomplished in accordance with the terms and conditions of the granted permit.</i></li> <li><i>• The developer shall provide evidence of implementation of this process to the degree possible to the City prior to any grading or construction activities.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>4.2MM-1(c) Prior to any grading or construction activities, the City shall require the developer to submit to the CDFG a formal verified wetland delineation based on current regulations of the Corps. The delineation shall include but not be limited to a determination of the nature of the jurisdiction of the unnamed tributary to Secret Ravine Creek, and the riparian areas within the project site. If the CDFG determines that jurisdictional waters on or off the project site would not be impacted by the</i></p>	

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>proposed project, no further mitigation is necessary.</i></p> <p><i>If CDFG determines that jurisdictional waters would be impacted by the proposed project, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, for any activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation. If required, the project developer shall coordinate with CDFG in developing appropriate mitigation, and shall abide by the conditions of any executed permits for any work related to the unnamed tributary to Secret Ravine Creek, or the riparian areas. The developer shall provide evidence of the completion of this process to the City prior to any grading or construction activity.</i></p>	
4.2I-2 Impacts to Special Status Plant Species	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.2I-3 Impacts to Northwestern Pond Turtle	PS	<p><i>4.2MM-3 A pre-construction survey for western pond turtle shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to any grading or construction activity, to determine presence or absence of this species in the project site. If construction is planned after April 1st, this survey shall include looking for turtle nests within the construction area. If northwestern pond turtles are not found within the project site, no further mitigation is required. If juvenile or adult turtles are found within the proposed</i></p>	LS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>construction area, the individuals should be moved out of the construction site with technical assistance from CDFG. If a nest is found within the construction area, construction shall not take place within 30 meters (100 feet) of the nest until the turtles have hatched.</i></p> <p><i>If a turtle is observed on the site, work shall cease in the area until the turtle can be moved to a safe location consistent with CDFG regulations. The above shall be completed for the review and approval by the Community Development Director. The survey shall be valid for one year; if construction does not take place within one year of the survey, a new survey shall be conducted.</i></p>	
4.2I-4 Impacts to Nesting Raptors	PS	<p><i>4.24.2 MM-4(a) Demolition and construction shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season, which extends from January through August. If demolition and construction cannot be scheduled to avoid nesting season, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</i></p> <p><i>4.2MM-4(b) Prior to any grading or construction activity, pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist to ensure that raptor nests would not be disturbed during project implementation. A pre-</i></p>	LS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>construction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of demolition/construction activities during the early part of the breeding season (January through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through August). During this survey, the qualified person shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for raptor nests.</i></p> <p><i>If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.</i></p> <p><i>A report shall be submitted to the City of Rocklin following the completion of the survey that includes, at the minimum, the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• A description of methodology including dates of field visits;</i></li> <li><i>• the names of survey personnel with resume;</i></li> <li><i>• a list of references cited and persons contacted;</i></li> <li><i>• and a map showing the location(s) of any raptor nests observed on the project site.</i></li> </ul>	

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>If the above survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on the project site, further mitigation would not be required. However, should any raptor species be found nesting on the project site, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</i></p> <p><i>4.2MM-4(c) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the following mitigation measures shall be completed for the review and approval by the City Engineer. The project applicant, in consultation with the City of Rocklin and CDFG, shall avoid all birds of prey nest sites located in the project site during the breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or eggs or young. The occupied nest shall be monitored by a qualified raptor biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a nondisturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone would be determined in consultation with the City and CDFG. Highly visible temporary construction fencing shall delineate the buffer zone.</i></p> <p><i>4.2MM-4(d) If a legally protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 30<sup>th</sup>, or until the adults and young</i></p>	

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<i>are no longer dependent on the nest site, as determined by a qualified biologist.</i>	
4.2I-5 Impacts to California Red-legged Frog	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.2I-6 Impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB)	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.2I-7 Short-term impacts to native oak trees	S	<p><i>4.2MM-7a Prior to any to any grading or construction activity, the project applicant must obtain a tree permit from the City that will include provisions for replacing lost trees and an oak tree restoration plan will be developed and implemented. This plan will provide for the replacement of as many oaks as feasible within the project area.</i></p> <p><i>4.2MM-7b If adequate locations cannot be found, as determined by the Development Services Manager, to replace all removed oak trees, then the remaining mitigation requirement may be met through payment into the existing City of Rocklin Tree Preservation Fund. Payments shall be calculated using the following formula:</i></p>	S/U

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p><i>Step 1:</i>  <i>TDBH of all Surveyed Trees on the Site</i>      <i>X</i>    <i>20%</i>    =    <i>Discount Diameter</i></p> <p><i>Step 2:</i>  <i>TDBH of all Surveyed Trees on the Site to be Removed</i>    -    <i>Discount Diameter</i>    =    <i>Total Number Inches of TDBH of Replacement Trees Required</i></p> <p><i>Such payments shall be made prior to the issuance of building permits, with review and approval by the City Engineer.</i></p> <p><i>4.2MM-7c</i>    <i>The protection of oak trees not scheduled for removal must comply with pertinent sections of the City's Oak Tree Preservation Guidelines.</i></p>	
4.2I-8 Long-Term impacts to native oak trees.	PS	<i>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2MM-7a through -7c would reduce long-term impacts to native oak trees on the project site to a less-than-significant level.</i>	LS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
4.2I-9 Loss of Foothill (Oak) Woodland Habitat.	S	<i>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2MM-7a through -7c would reduce the magnitude of the impact; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</i>	SU
4.2I-10 Construction of the Proposed Project in Conjunction With Other Development in the County, Could Contribute to the Loss of Native Plant Communities, Wildlife Habitat Values, Special-Status Species and Their Potential Habitat, and Wetland Resources in the Region.	S	4.2MM-10 <i>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.2MM-1 through 4.2MM-7.</i>	SU
<b>4.3 Transportation and Circulation</b>			
4.3I-1 Impacts to Study Intersections	PS	4-3MM-1 <i>The following improvements shall be implemented as part of the project. These improvements would ensure that the Sierra College/Rocklin Road intersection would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service:</i>  <i><u>Sierra College Boulevard/Rocklin Road</u></i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Eastbound approach- One (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes, and one (1) right turn lane.</i></li> <li>• <i>Westbound approach- Two (2) left-turn lanes, one</i></li> </ul>	LS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance after Mitigation</i>
		<p>(1) through lane, and one (1) through right-turn lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northbound approach- Two (2) left-turn lanes, three (3) through lanes, and one (1) right-turn lane.</li> <li>• Southbound approach- One (1) left-turn lane, three (3) through lanes, and one (1) right turn lane.</li> </ul>	
4.3I-2 Increased demand for transit services.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.3I-3 Increased demand for bicycle facilities.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.3I-4 Increased hazards from site design	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
4.3I-5 Cumulative Impacts to Study Intersections	LS	<i>None required.</i>	N/A
<b>Impacts and Mitigation Measures Included in the Initial Study</b>			
XI.A Exposure to persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	PS	<i>A detail for the trash enclosure shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Community Development Department. The enclosure shall be designed to block line of sight from the refuse hauling truck to the residences south of the project site. The minimum wall height shall be 8 feet above the commercial driveway elevation</i>	LTS

MM = Mitigation Measure; NI = No Impact; N/A = Not Applicable; LS = Less-than-Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable