

Letter 43
cont'd

43-54 **protection/restoration of similar historic stone structures, pay a mitigation fee to the Rocklin Historical Society, or move the corral to a more prominent location for preservation in the city.**

43-55 In the Cultural Resources section, on page 4.7-26, it is stated, "Additionally, the National Register of Historic Places requires consideration of significance of any structure over 45 years old." This criteria must be applied to the historic stone walls on both ridges and the corral, and any refusal or neglect to do so, or to analyze the impacts, and provide MM, is a serious lack of compliance with CEQA. **Please consider a MM that will avoid the historic stone walls and the historic corral.**

43-56 In the list of agencies contacted to review this DEIR, no mention can be found of the California State Office of Historic Preservation. Even if a notice was sent, it was incumbent upon the lead agency and the applicant to have the historic resources analyzed and evaluated for a determination of their significance by this state agency. To not have done so, is to deny the public an opportunity to review such an analysis and to preserve an important resource. **Please conduct a thorough analysis of all the historic stone wall remnants as well as the historic corral in the valley and circulate for public review.**

43-57 It is stated in the DEIR that California State Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) can include properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys. Since Rocklin's General Plan specifically calls out Chinese rock walls as a cultural resource, this constitutes an inclusion and mandates their protection. **Please adhere to CEQA, SHPO, and General Plan policies and protect and preserve the walls in perpetuity as the valuable resource they are.**

43-58 Page 4.3-20, 4.3 I-10—To designate the increased lighting and glare as potentially significant is an understatement. Not only are two of the mentioned lighting impacts significant (altering the unlit and enclosed aspect of the valley as well as impacting views from Loomis), there are numerous other significant lighting impacts that were not analyzed. There are impacts to wildlife—disoriented migrating birds, along with other animals who rely on natural night light for survival. The night sky, which is every citizen's common wealth, will be diminished with the light and glare from the project. There is no mention of residential "light trespass" which occurs when one neighbor's night light casts obnoxious glare and unwanted night light from yard lights.

43-59 The MM mention residential, but focus on commercial. The MM need to address irrational fears of darkness and prohibit the use of security lights, especially high intensity, that are ineffective nuisances. **Please address the impacts and necessary MM measures more vigorously.**

43-60 Page 4.3-23, 4.3 MM-11. Since luminosity is a relatively simple level to measure, specific limits should be imposed. To reference the signage program that is not yet developed or reviewed or approved gives reviewers nothing to comment on. To dismiss the impact with a MM of "minimize" is meaningless. **Please be more specific with signage luminosity and require a specific measurable illumination level.**

43-61 Page 4.3-23, 4.3 I-12. To state that cumulative visual character impacts in the region are expected to continue with the current growth momentum and to then conclude that therefore Rocklin can do nothing to alter the future visual character of the project site is unacceptable. For CEQA purposes, cumulative impacts must be analyzed and not dismissed because "everybody else is doing it." This statement also contradicts other statements in the DEIR that mention the valley's "enclosed aspect" (page 4.3-20) and

Letter 43 cont'd

- 43-61 ↑ “Only a limited portion of the site is visible to the general public on a regular basis.” (page 4.3-1) What happens down in the valley to impact its visual character is isolated from its surroundings; however, to state that the altered visual impact is significant and unavoidable is simply not true. It IS avoidable.
Due to its protective ridges, the project site is NOT impacted by surrounding growth. The project itself will cause cumulative impacts and contribute visual impacts to the surrounding communities and to the valley’s current visual resources. Without the project, there will be a buffer, a relief, from the cumulative impacts. **Please consider the alternative of not developing the center portion of the valley, but rather, consolidate the units at either end (50 acres at the south end, and approximately 72 acres at the north end) to leave approximately 500 acres of preserve, wildlife sanctuary, museum, educational/interpretive center roughly in the center.**
- 43-62 The above alternative would satisfy Rocklin’s General Plan, Land Use, page 5, Policy 12, which states, “To encourage the use of the “village concept” in new projects of 500 acres or more in size, in order to encourage higher density core areas and encourage alternatives to the use of the automobile for short trips.” **Please consider development at either end of the 622 acres and not the sprawling, disconnected project as proposed.**
- 4.4 Transportation and Circulation**
- 43-63 Page 44.13, Policy 10. This General Plan Policy requires park-and-ride lots, bus turnouts, and passenger shelters, but **where are those amenities on the map(s)? The Air Quality section also refers to the bus turnouts, but their locations are not indicated? Please provide locations of bus turnouts so that public review can be meaningful.**
- 43-64 Page 4.4-13, Policy 16. This General Plan policy under the goal of meeting community needs states that the City will coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions on the completion and improvement of roads which extend into other communities. With that spirit of cooperation in mind; on page 4.4-31, after a discussion of the increased traffic impacts, it is stated that even though significant, the intersection is in the Town of Loomis so the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. **How is this approach to solving the traffic impacts conducive to cooperation and coordination?**
- 43-65 Page 4.4-18. In making traffic volume assumptions for 2025, it is stated that the model used was updated and validated in 2001. The model may have been updated and validated in 2001, but a 5-year old model is outdated in today’s rapid growth of the region and with a 2006 DEIR. With the Bickford Ranch recent increased density zoning entitlements (see Bickford Ranch settlement agreement, December 2005, which could add an additional 250 units just north of the proposed Clover Valley project as well as in the Meadows Area for an additional 500 to 1,000 units), plus the extra 501 homes referenced on the north end of Clover Valley from the oversized sewer line, **how can a 5-year old model provide accurate traffic analysis with this region’s unprecedented rapid growth rate? Was the modeling based on the 1082 units mentioned in the DEIR plus the additional 500 -1,000+ units from expanded Bickford plans? Please provide a current, up-to-date traffic analysis and allow a public review.**
- 43-66 ↓ On page 4.4-19, this perplexity continues with the following statement: “Due to major differences in regional land use and roadway networks between 2001 and 2025, the distribution of trips from the project site differs between the Existing Plus Proposed

**Letter 43
cont'd**

43-66
cont'd

↑ **Project and the 2025 Plus Proposed Project Conditions.” Please interpret or translate this sentence and explain its significance.**

43-67

Page 4.4-23, 4.4 I-3. To state that bikeways currently exist on the five listed roadways is a disingenuous statement. Riding on Sierra College Blvd with automobiles and trucks traveling at 55 mph plus may constitute a bikeway, but most bikers who care about life and limb will not ride it. Riding on Taylor Road where striping appears and disappears represents another marginal and unsafe bikeway. In addition, Taylor Road is uneven and hazardous from a bike rider’s perspective. To ride on King Road is akin to a life-threatening experience. With Valley View Parkway being referenced as the “shortcut,” traffic will funnel through Loomis via Kind Road making it even more unsuitable as a safe bikeway.

The Class II bikeway planned for Valley View Parkway may be a step in the right direction, but it will be the bikeway to nowhere. The three aforementioned residential roadways are not conducive to bike riding and, until improved to safe bikeway levels, will curtail using Valley View Parkway as a bikeway. Only if the three mentioned were improved would the Valley View Parkway become a viable bikeway. Thus, contrary to what is stated, the proposed project would NOT accommodate bicycles consistent with the city’s bikeway policies. **The impact is significant and thus requires MM.**

43-68

The narrative on transportation along with Figure 4.4-3 “speaks” in terms of traffic volumes. However, the tables refer to V/C—volume-capacity ratio. Again, an intent of CEQA is to encourage public participation. By not including volumes with the tables, the public has to try to compare two different data formats. **Please provide volumes consistently throughout the analysis and recirculate the DEIR for public review.**

43-69

Page 4.4-30. Traffic impacts to some “minor” roads are shown on Figure 4.4-5. However, the impacts to the “minor” roads is underestimated. As more people discover the “shortcuts” either to I-80 or to Auburn-Folsom Road, the “minor” roads will be significantly impacted. English Colony, King to Boyington to Penryn, and either King or Horseshoe Bar Roads to Auburn-Folsom already have increased traffic from five years ago. **Please give more emphasis to the impacts when “short cuts” using minor back roads become preferred alternatives.** Rocklin has had some first-hand experience with this and had to block off a residential road off Granite Drive (Manzanita Dr) to ensure the safety of the neighborhood.

4.5 Air Quality

43-70

Page 4.5-5. Although diesel exhaust is detailed as a TAC of growing concern, identified as a human carcinogen, and trains are cited as being one of the largest sources of diesel emissions, no where in this DEIR can we find any monitoring of train diesel emissions near the railroad tracks. One can be anywhere on the crest of the east ridge of the project above the tracks, and when a train passes below, the fumes and diesel exhaust can be easily detected unless strong winds are blowing it away. **Please take measurements for diesel all along the west ridge. Please provide this information to the public for review in a new DEIR.**

43-71

↓ Also, when slightly below the crest on the west side of the west ridge, depending upon wind and other conditions, the fumes and exhaust can also be detected, albeit to a lesser degree depending upon prevailing winds. **Diesel fumes and exhaust from the**

**Letter 43
cont'd**

43-71
cont'd

↑ **trains must be analyzed in the air quality studies and the results released for public review.**

43-72

Trees are known to help with air pollution problems. Tree foliage works as a natural air filter of particulate matter such as dust, micro-sized metals, and pollutants. Trees take in carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. Trees also cool the air through water evaporating from leaves and direct shade. Air filtering combined with the cooling effect of trees can have a significant impact on reducing smog and overall air pollution. Forty trees in a neighborhood can remove 80 lbs of air pollutants annually (Center for Urban Forest Research, Pacific Southwest Research Station, US Forest Service, Davis, CA from Sacramento Tree Foundation). **Were air quality impacts from the removal of over 7,400 established trees analyzed? Please study the impact of the tree removal on air quality and provide the information for public review.**

43-73

Page 4.5-10, 4.5 MM-1(a): The MM seem comprehensive, but where are the penalties for noncompliance? Who will pay for, or fund, the monitor designee's time? Where is the monitoring element for the additional dust-control measures for on-and off-site project components that would not be constructed/developed immediately following the mass-grading phase?

43-74

Page 4.5-13, 4.5 MM-2(A): Bus turnouts are referenced here (and as previously noted in the transportation section), but none can be found on the detailed maps. Where are they to be located?

In satisfying the General Plan Policy 10 of the Circulation Element, please identify locations of park-and-ride lots and passenger shelters along with the turnouts.

43-75

Page 4.5-14, 4.5MM-2(e): With Clover Valley's distinct "bowl" configuration, to allow wood burning fireplaces is to invite unregulated emissions. As stated in the DEIR, if smoke from wood burning fireplaces or wood stoves are responsible for the majority of PM10 area source emissions, then a more reasonable MM would be to prohibit all such stoves or fireplaces in the project. Since such restrictions are feasible and appropriate; please incorporate in the MM.

4.6, Noise

43-76

As stated in Rocklin's GP, Section E. Noise Element, due to Rocklin's varied geographic features, as well as a major noise source being the railroad, the best approach for land use is to plan locations in such a way as to minimize exposure of sensitive receptors, such as residences, to substantial noise sources. It is also stated that railroad activity is (1) not subject to control of the city, and (2) could change with increased frequency of passenger rail service between Auburn and the Bay Area. This will affect noise levels in the community.

The Noise Element of the GP recognizes disruptive noises (often defined as unwanted sound) and a need to prevent noise impacts from occurring in new development. Because noise issues are so important, noise modeling and measurements have been developed. However, it is noted that "because local topography...may significantly affect noise exposure at a particular location, the noise contours should not be considered site-specific."

Letter 43 cont'd

- 43-77 Clover Valley is akin to an amphitheater, with noise augmented and transferred within its steep contours. Not only is noise amplified, but it can also be increased greatly by echoing. One diesel engine, garbage truck, stereo, yard maintenance equipment, dog bark, etc., becomes many. Ask anyone who lives at an elevation above others. Depending upon atmospheric conditions, low volume conversations at distances of 200 feet can be clearly audible. **Please re-examine the noise impacts in relationship to Clover Valley's unique landscape.**
- 43-78 Reference is made to Clover Valley's lack of noise: "The project area is mostly isolated from major noise sources due mainly to the shielding of the valley by hills in all directions...existing ambient noise conditions...are subjectively considered to be fairly low." (Vol I, page 4.6-4 and Vol II, page 4.5-2) The DEIR goes on to analyze traffic, railroad, park, and commercial noises as they impact some future residential units of the development, but omits any analysis of noise impacts on the valley itself as it exists today. The noise impacts analysis to the proposed residential development is thorough, except for proposed residences above the valley floor, but it is incomplete without an analysis of how the noise impacts of the proposed development will effect the existing conditions. **The current DEIR neglects to study the noise impacts that the development will have on the 622 acres as they exist today. Please provide a noise analysis of the proposed development on the property's existing relative quiet and recirculate the findings for comment in a new DEIR.**
- 43-79 **Please analyze the noise impacts to residences on the slopes of the valley as well.**
- 43-80 Since the Noise Element states that up to 15 trains per day travel in each direction, not counting warning horns (which may be required at unarmored crossings, such as Boulder Ridge Road or other crossings in Rocklin), the decibel rating is stated as 100dB. Considering the Weighted Maximum Sound Level chart shows "Threshold of pain" at 130 dB, and a "Shotgun at 200 feet" also at 100 dB, then it is obvious that the train noise in Clover Valley could be quite significant.
- From the map of Monitoring Locations, it appears that no testing was performed above the railroad tracks where residential units are proposed. Please analyze all proposed residence locations that are located above railroad tracks and include the results in a new DEIR for public review.**
- 43-81 One of the stated General Plan Goals (1) is to protect City residents from harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise. Another of the stated General Plan Policies (N-2 of Goal 3) is to use noise barriers but to discourage aesthetically intrusive wall heights. Yet this is exactly what has been proposed in the Clover Valley development. **Please explain why 6 to 8 feet tall masonry "sound" walls are proposed when their negative impacts are as significant as the noise impacts they are trying to block.**
- 43-82 The CV DEIR claims that railroad noise levels are predicted to be approximately 60dB Ldn. This unrealistic understatement of the magnitude of the noise impact can be proven indisputably by simply visiting the site as any one of the estimated 15 daily trains passes. Not only is the noise loud enough to "drown out" normal conversation, there is also vibration and diesel fumes (depending upon prevailing winds). The cut of the ridgeline does not provide additional shielding of noise, as stated; if anything, the elevation augments the noise. Thus the 60 dB prediction claim is incorrect.

**Letter 43
cont'd**

- 43-82 **Please visit the existing Loomis residence(s) either on Clover Valley Road or on Boulder Ridge Road to experience a passing train and measure the impacts of train noise. Please mitigate accordingly.**
- 43-83 No reference is made to the proposed lots at the southeast end of the proposed project (lots 523 thru 543 plus 557 and 558 on Sierra View Ct). Yet when one stands in that area, train noises are clearly audible. **Where are the noise impact study results from that area? Please conduct noise impact studies and make the information available to the public via a new EIR.**
- 43-84 The railroad tracks referenced are generally the eastbound or “up hill” direction. The engines are generally “working harder” than the westbound “down hill” lines resulting in more noise and more exhaust. From above the tracks, on existing homes, at much greater distances from the tracks than the proposed CV homes, the noise, the fumes, and the vibrations are all very evident. It would appear that these impacts were not considered. **Please indicate if/where the studies were conducted for impacts on all residences above the tracks. Please conduct train noise impact analysis above the tracks and distribute results for public review.**
- 43-85 Page 4.6-4. It is stated that the project area is mostly isolated from major noise sources due mainly to the shielding of the valley by hills in all directions. This may be true for the majority of the valley floor. However, even at one or two locations in the valley, traffic noise can be heard from the valley floor where Park Drive is visible from the valley floor. Because no noise impact studies were conducted from the valley floor, the existing and predicted increased traffic flows on Park Drive are not presented. **Please analyze noise impacts from the valley floor and make the results available to the public for review via a new EIR.**
- 43-86 The DEIR goes on to state that “noise from Sierra College Boulevard defines the ambient conditions, but that roadway is mostly shielded from view of the rest of the project by intervening topography.” This implies that “shielded from view” equates to shielded from the annoyance of ambient noise. Before such a claim can be made, the relationship between view and audible should be determined. **What is the relationship between sight and audibility? Please explain and analyze noise from sources out of the viewing range.**
- 43-87 **Why was the study conducted on one day only when train traffic or schedules are not consistent according to Union Pacific and the previously certified Programmatic EIR from 1995?**
- 43-88 Existing residents living on Sierra College Blvd near the long, straight grade from approximately Del Mar to the curve and crest have had to live with railroad noises for years. Although they report they can “get used to it,” the one noise that has been repeatedly mentioned as “maddening” is the noise from the trucks coming from the crest, just after the curve, headed downhill southbound. Reportedly, “jake brakes” are one of the most annoying, loud, consistent sounds to be heard from Sierra College Blvd. **With Sierra College being a major truck route, “jake brakes” should be acknowledged as a significant impact. Please analyze down hill truck noise and provide appropriate mitigation for this impact.**
- 43-89 Residents along Sierra College Boulevard have also cited annoying noise from loud motorcycles traveling in both directions along Sierra College Blvd, especially on weekend rides. Traveling either alone or in groups of 25 or more, motorcycles “roar” up and down Sierra College Blvd causing extremely loud and annoying noise levels. This is

**Letter 43
cont'd**

- 43-89
cont'd
- ↑ not what occurs on local neighborhood streets, but on more rural roads, such as Sierra College Blvd. These types of motorcycle weekend outings are also likely to use the “short cut” of Valley View Parkway. **Please analyze impacts of loud and excessive recreational motorcycle outings as they pass through these existing neighborhoods and proposed development, and impact on existing valley silence where the parkway is proposed. Please provide meaningful mitigation.**
- 43-90
- Page 4.6-9-10—I-1:
(a) The noise impacts are said to be less than significant along Park Drive due to existing sound barriers, and this may be true. However, new homes in the proposed project (Deerview Way and Rasberry Ct, and Blackberry Ct) will experience unacceptable noise intrusion from the increased traffic on Park Dr. Sound walls may diminish the impact, but they won’t stop the constant drone of the ambient sound of constant traffic. Instead of sporadic noise of individual passing cars, the noise will be an increasing, steady drone of traffic noise, including but not limited to boom boxes, sirens, etc. CEQA is clear regarding the impact of either a permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels, as this proposed project will induce.
How is this continual sound, increased ambient noise—separate from dB levels—being mitigated?
- 43-91
- (b) The sound walls will destroy the aesthetics—the views of the snow-capped Sierra Nevada, the foothills, and other surrounding vistas. These views belong to the public and to other homeowners. Whether walking or driving on Park Drive, the experience will be reduced to being in a long masonry channel with vegetation planted to assuage the loss. To mitigate the noise with sound walls, the homes should be set back from the ridgelines to a point where sound wall heights will not interfere with views.
Why are units being allowed that violate a stated goal of the General Plan—to not allow encroachment of “noise sensitive uses onto noise-producing facilities”?
Why is General Plan Policies (N-2 of Goal 3) not being followed and such an inconsistency being allowed?
- 43-92
- Why are sound walls being allowed in an area where the public has been allowed to view great vistas (especially on Park Drive where views on both sides will be obstructed by masonry walls)? Why are sound walls being considered mitigation when with this project they are a major impact to the view shed? The sound walls also block the prevailing late afternoon summer cooling delta breezes, causing an increase in energy use for cooling. Please prepare impact analysis of the masonry walls, provide MM, and circulate for public review.**
Were alternatives to sound walls that block views considered—such as setbacks so that the tops of sound walls will not obstruct views (which would in turn follow GP policy as stated above)?
- 43-93
- What are the impacts of sound walls on wildlife corridors? How will wildlife pass by 6 to 8 foot masonry fences, or any of the other fences that will surround most of the proposed units?**
- 43-94
- Impact 4.6 I-3: It is incorrect to rely on “setbacks and shielding from view by intervening topography as adequate, reliable predictors of Rocklin’s 60 dB noise level standard. It is grossly incorrect to conclude this impact is less-than-significant based on setbacks and shielding. One only has to visit the existing homes in Loomis on the eastern ridge. Not only are train noises clearly intrusive, there is also vibration and fume odors.
How many trains passed and what were the readings during the one-day 24-hour study?
- ↓

**Letter 43
cont'd**

- 43-94
cont'd ↑ **What were the dB results—not “predictions,” but “results”?**
What type of standardized approved equipment was used to test noise levels and how was it calibrated?
- 43-95 In checking the weather history in the area for the 24-hour period on December 8, 2005, the day of the testing, it was ascertained that cloud cover and precipitation were both present.
What were the climate conditions where the equipment was placed on the one day testing was conducted? How did those conditions affect the sound testing?
- 43-96 **Page 4.6-13, MM-4.** Although noise disturbance associated with commercial activities are mentioned, the MM throws the possibility of “berms” into the mix. Other than the use of sound walls, which will be ineffective depending upon residential setbacks from the commercial activities, we need more information regarding the suggested berms (composition, height, vegetation, proximity to both commercial and residential, maintained by whom, etc.) We need to know how the berms are expected to bring down the noise dB levels. **Please provide data on this MM and allow public review.**
- 43-97 **Page 4.6-13, section 4.6 I-5.** In addition to traditional construction activities that generate significant noises, blasting is mentioned as a possibility. Given Rocklin’s history with rock surfaces, the likelihood of blasting or jack hammer occurrences, both at on-site and off-site construction activities, are considerable. Because the extent of the rock surfaces appears to be unknown, this adverse noise impact cannot be realistically mitigated. Instead, boring should be conducted to the depth of proposed trenches to ascertain EXACTLY where blasting, jack hammers, or other significant noise will occur. With regard to the off-site sewer line specifically, should test results indicate that an unreasonable level of highly annoying noise (e.g., blasting, jack hammers, etc.) will be necessary, then the construction of the off-site sewer line must be prohibited and the construction activities abandoned. This would favor the “Maximum 180 Units Alternative (page 6-8) as the only feasible project.
Please conduct soil/rock sampling to determine before the proposed project begins exactly how much impenetrable rock will be encountered.
Please address the unreasonable impacts of blasting and jackhammer noises (on wildlife, domestic animals, people, as well as potential damage to private property as a result of vibrations) and weigh the alternatives in light of these impacts.
- 43-98 **Page 4.6-18—4.6 MM-8(a):** The 6-foot tall barriers along Sierra College Boulevard being increased to 8 feet is unacceptable.
How will wildlife running across Sierra College Boulevard be able to jump uphill over an 8-foot wall?
What will the death toll be of animals either blocked in their migrations or in their flight from predators as they hit the walls?
How many traffic accidents and resultant injuries from hitting, or trying to avoid hitting, wildlife on Sierra College Blvd (or Park Drive) will occur?
How have these sound wall impacts to wildlife been mitigated?
- 43-99 Data from “Highway Traffic Noise in the United States Problem and Response” from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, April 2000, suggests that although sound walls can reduce noise, there are impacts from using them.