

---

---

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

---

---

---

---

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

---

---

### INTRODUCTION

---

The Public Services and Utilities chapter describes the public service systems and facilities within the project area and the associated potential impacts resulting from the proposed project. Utilities and services considered in the analysis include water supply, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, schools, parks, electric power, natural gas, and communications systems. The Public Services and Utilities chapter also discusses thresholds of significance for such impacts, and identifies mitigation measures and monitoring strategies. Consideration will be given to on-site as well as off-site infrastructure facilities. Information for this chapter is based upon interviews with City of Rocklin agencies, the *SB 221 and SB 610 Analysis for Clover Valley Subdivision*<sup>1</sup> by Placer County Water Agency (see Appendix Q of this Draft EIR), the *City of Rocklin General Plan*<sup>2</sup>, and the technical reports that resulted in the *City of Rocklin 2005 Draft General Plan Document* (online). Pertinent comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project have been considered in this analysis.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

The setting section describes the existing water supply system, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, schools, parks, electric power, natural gas, and communications systems for the City of Rocklin.

Table 4.12-1 shows the service providers within the City of Rocklin.

<b>Table 4.12-1 Public Services and Providers</b>	
<b>Public Service or Facility</b>	<b>Service or Facility Provider</b>
Law Enforcement	City of Rocklin; Placer County Sheriff's Department
Fire and Emergency Services	City of Rocklin; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Ambulance Service	Contract with Placer County; Service provided by American Medical Response (AMR)
Schools	Rocklin Unified School District; Loomis Union School District; Placer Union High School District; Sierra College
Libraries	Auburn-Placer Library
Parks and Recreation Programs	City of Rocklin Community Services and Facilities Department
Domestic Water Service	Placer County Water Agency
Wastewater Collection and Treatment (sewer)	South Placer Municipal Utility District
Stormwater and Drainage	City of Rocklin and Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Solid Waste	Western Placer Waste Management Authority
Road Maintenance	City of Rocklin, Department of Public Works; County of Placer
Electricity and Natural Gas	Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
Telephone Service	Pacific Bell and Roseville Telephone
Cable Television	Starstream Communications
Cemetery	Rocklin Cemetery District
Source: City of Rocklin Draft General Plan, 2005.	

## **Water Supply**

The City is supplied with water through long-term contracts with the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). The Rocklin planning area is located within PCWA's Lower Zone 1, the service area which generally encompasses Rocklin, the Loomis Basin, the industrial corridor paralleling State Route 65, and the City of Lincoln. Three water supply sources are available to meet PCWA Lower Zone 1 water demands. The sources include a Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) supply contract, the Middle Fork Project supply, and the Central Valley Project supply.

### Available Water Supply

In their *SB 221 and SB 610 Analysis for the Clover Valley Subdivision* dated December 16, 2005, PCWA indicates they have several sources of surface water supply entitlements available for use in western Placer County. The following water supply entitlements are for Zones 1 and 5.

- The first is a surface water supply contract with PG&E for 100,400 acre-feet annually (afa) of Yuba/Bear River water that is delivered through PG&E's Drum Spaulding hydro system and is PCWA's primary source of supply for Zone 1. This source of water has a high reliability during normal, single-dry and multiple-dry years. For example, between 1987 and 1992 the State experienced 5 years of drought, during which many areas in the State had reduced supplies. During that period, PCWA had a full Yuba/Bear River supply each year. 1977 was the only year in which PCWA has had to impose drought restrictions on its customers due to reduced PG&E supply.
- PCWA's second source of surface water for consumptive use is its Middle Fork Project (MFP). The MFP reservoirs have 340,000 acre-feet of storage capacity; however, pursuant to agreements with the federal government, PCWA is limited to a maximum consumptive use of 120,000 afa from this source. PCWA's MFP water right permits provide that this water supply may be diverted from the American River at either Auburn or at Folsom Reservoir. PCWA has done extensive modeling of the MFP system to determine its reliability during drought events using California's hydrologic record, which dates back to 1921. The conclusion of that analysis is that the MFP can provide 120,000 afa, even in dry years as severe as the 1976-1977 hydrologic event.
- PCWA's third source of surface water is its federal Central Valley Project (CVP) Municipal and Industrial water supply contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation. The contract with the Bureau of Reclamation is for 35,000 afa. This supply is subject to 25 percent deficiencies during single-dry and multiple-dry years. This water was originally to be provided to PCWA at Auburn Reservoir but the contract as amended now provides for its diversion at Folsom Dam or other locations mutually agreed to by the parties. As noted below in the discussion of infrastructure capacity, Reclamation and PCWA are now studying the feasibility of diverting this supply off of the Sacramento River instead of at Folsom. Under PCWA's Integrated Water Resources Plan, discussed in more detail below, PCWA plans to supplement its CVP contract supply with groundwater in dry years to improve the reliability to the point where the full contract amount can be relied upon to serve urban development needs.
- PCWA also has a surface water contract to purchase up to 5,000 afa from South Sutter Water District (SSWD), but this supply is only available when it is surplus to SSWD's needs, and this water would be made available only as a supplemental supply to agricultural customers in Zone 5. Water is not expected to be available from this source during dry years. Additionally, this source is considered temporary because it is expected that the available supply will eventually be fully utilized by SSWD. This water source, therefore, cannot be included in the available water supply for the proposed project. PCWA indicated in their December 16, 2005 letter that the loss of the SSWD supply, either due to drought or prior use by SSWD, would not affect the water supply to Zone 1.

The total surface water supply available to the western Placer County area that includes Zones 1 and 5 is 255,400 afa of permanent supply, plus 5,000 afa of temporary surplus water. Out of that permanent supply, PCWA has contracted to deliver up to 25,000 afa to San Juan Water District for use within the Placer County portion of its service area and up to 30,000 afa to the City of Roseville. PCWA has also contracted to deliver up to 29,000 afa to Sacramento Suburban Water District for groundwater stabilization in that district's service area, but only when the supply is surplus to the needs of Placer County. Because of the surplus nature of this contract, it is not a factor in determining water availability for PCWA's service area.

In 2004, PCWA used 112,768 af to meet the needs of its Zone 1 & 5 customers. In addition to this amount, to date PCWA has approved applications for water service totaling an additional 5,753 af, resulting in a total current committed demand of 118,521 afa. In 2004, PCWA delivered 13,562 af to San Juan and 465 af to Roseville; however, because these deliveries would only occur during surplus years, these figure are not included in the calculation of PCWA's total available water supply. Therefore, 241,373 afa of surface water is available in normal years for use in Western Placer County to meet future demands.

Table 4.12-2 identifies PCWA's existing water supply entitlements and demands, and shows the total surface water available for future demands.

<b>Table 4.12-2 Water Supply Entitlements and Demands</b>	
<b>Entitlements</b>	
Yuba/Bear River water through PG&E	100,400 acre-feet annually (afa)
Middle Fork Project on the American River	120,000 afa
Central Valley Project through U.S. Bureau of Reclamation at Auburn Reservoir, Folsom Dam, etc.	35,000 afa
<b>Total Entitlements</b>	<b>255,400<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Demands</b>	
2004 usage by Zones 1 and 5	112,768 afa
Approved applications for water service	5,753 afa
<b>Total Demand</b>	<b>118,521 afa<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>Surface Water Availability for Future Demands</b>	<b>(255,400-118,521) = 136,879 afa</b>
Notes:	
1. The total entitlements sum shown here does not include the 5,000 afa from South Sutter Water District because this supply is only available when it is surplus to SSWD's needs, and would be made available only as a supplemental supply to agricultural customers in Zone 5.	
2. 2004 delivery to San Juan was 13,562 af, and 2004 delivery to Roseville was 465 af; however, because of the surplus nature of the water supply contracts to these areas, these figures are not included in permanent demand for PCWA.	
Source: Placer County Water Agency. <i>SB 221 and SB 610 Analysis for Clover Valley Subdivision</i> , December 16, 2005.	

### *Groundwater*

Although groundwater use in Placer County by individual homes, farms and businesses is estimated to be about 90,000 afa, PCWA does not currently use significant amounts of groundwater to meet its customers' demands. PCWA has a single well located in the Sunset Industrial area that meets all drinking water standards but has not been utilized for

several years due to customer concerns regarding water quality (hardness and silica) related to industrial use.

The following findings with regards to the use of groundwater can be concluded from PCWA's draft Integrated Water Resources Plan:

- The historic average annual rate of groundwater use within the Placer County portion of the North American River Groundwater Basin is estimated to be about 90,000 acre feet per year.
- According to semi-annual well data collected by the State Department of Water Resources since the 1940s, the subsurface groundwater level in western Placer County in the area west of Roseville has been relatively stable since the early 1980s following decades of steady decline.
- Based upon this information, PCWA believes that the current groundwater use and natural recharge rate are in balance and that current average annual groundwater pumping rates within the basin can be sustained indefinitely without a further decline in the subsurface groundwater level.
- As urban development replaces historic groundwater irrigated agriculture, an opportunity exists to develop groundwater for use in meeting urban domestic and irrigation demands without adversely affecting groundwater levels or long-term groundwater reliability.

PCWA's surface water supplies, particularly its 35,000 afa CVP contract entitlement, will be subject to shortages in future dry years. To make up for such dry year shortfalls and for backup in the event of emergency or planned outages, PCWA is planning on developing groundwater resources as its service area expands west over the groundwater basin and into the area most likely to be served long term from the Sacramento River using PCWA's CVP contract supply. But to ensure that adverse long-term impacts of such dry year groundwater use do not occur, groundwater banking must occur in normal and wet years to offset the planned dry year use. That banking can most efficiently occur through "in-lieu recharge" which is the reduction of historic groundwater use in normal and wet years, allowing the natural recharge flow to accumulate in the aquifer.

#### *Recycled Water Use*

Recycled water use by projects within a reasonable service perimeter of reclaimed water supplies is assumed in PCWA's draft Integrated Water Resources Plan. The proposed project, because of its location and lacking infrastructure, does not have the ability to be served with recycled water.

#### Urban Water Management Plan

PCWA's 2005 Urban Water Management Plan was adopted during December 2005 and contains a water shortage contingency analysis that includes a five-stage rationing plan that will be declared in the event of a water shortage.

Integrated Water Resources Plan

In a discussion paper issued by PCWA entitled Surface Water Supply Update for Western Placer County in March 2001, PCWA concluded that its water entitlements were sufficient to meet the projected demands based on current General Plan provisions. In the fall of 2004 PCWA and its consultant, Brown & Caldwell, began work on an Integrated Water Resources Plan (IWRP) for western Placer County that is intended to build on the 2001 Discussion Paper and incorporate changes to General Plans within PCWA’s west Placer service area since 2001, proposed changes to general plans currently under consideration by west Placer land use authorities, and quantify the previous assumptions on future water use efficiency, recycled water use, groundwater use and build out demand requirements in the San Juan and Roseville service areas. PCWA expects this plan to be completed in the fourth quarter of 2005.

Water Delivery

Table 4.12-3 below summarizes the infrastructure capacity of PCWA’s various water supply entitlements. Infrastructure is discussed below in more detail.

<b>Table 4.12-3 Water Infrastructure Capacity</b>		
<b>Entitlements</b>	<b>Acre-feet entitlement</b>	<b>Delivery Capacity</b>
Yuba/Bear River water through PG&E	100,400 afa <sup>1</sup>	100,400
Middle Fork Project on the American River	120,000 afa	113,400 <sup>2</sup>
Central Valley Project through U.S. Bureau of Reclamation at Auburn Reservoir, Folsom Dam, etc.	35,000 afa	35,000 afa
<b>Total Entitlements</b>	<b>255,400<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>248,800</b>
<b>Demands</b>		
2004 usage by Zones 1 and 5	112,768 afa	
Approved applications for water service	5,753 afa	
<b>Total Demand</b>	<b>118,521 afa</b>	
<b>Surface Water Availability for Future Demands</b>	(255,400-118,521) <b>= 136,789</b>	
Notes: 1. afa = acre-feet annually 2. This figure is the current permanent capacity of existing infrastructure. On a temporary basis, during normal/wet years, this number could go up to 118,400 afa. After the completion of the American River pump station in 2007, the permanent, normal/wet year delivery capability will rise to 135,900 afa. Source: Placer County Water Agency. <i>SB 221 and SB 610 Analysis for Clover Valley Subdivision</i> , December 16, 2005.		

*Raw Water Delivery from the Yuba/Bear River*

PCWA has indicated that infrastructure requirements for the delivery of 100 percent of PCWA surface water supply entitlements under its PG&E (100,400 afa) and SSWD (5,000 afa) contracts are adequate, and that infrastructure limitations do not exist.

### *Raw Water Delivery from the American River*

The only facility that PCWA currently has to deliver water to its service area from its American River supplies is the temporary American River Pump Station at Auburn. Under an agreement between PCWA and the United States, the U.S. is required to install temporary pumps in the American River so that PCWA can access up to 25,000 afa of its MFP water at a rate of 50 cubic feet per second (cfs). Because of flooding concerns which necessitates the seasonal removal of the temporary pumps, and other technical limitations, PCWA estimates that it can only reliably divert up to 13,000 afa with the current configuration installed by the U.S.

As limited by the temporary American River Pump Station, the total current raw water delivery capacity available to Zones 1 & 5 is 113,400 afa on a permanent basis and 118,400 afa on temporary basis in normal/wet years.

Progress by PCWA and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is being made in completing a new, permanent American River Pump Station. On June 13, 2003, the Bureau of Reclamation entered into a contract to construct Phase I of the American River Pump Station. Phase I will likely be completed in May of 2006. Phase 2, which includes construction of the diversion facility and rewatering of the river, has been designed and is currently out to bid. The construction contract for Phase II will likely be awarded in December 2005 and completion will be in April of 2007.

Completion of this project will increase PCWA's raw water delivery capacity to Zone 1 and Western Placer County to 135,900 afa on a permanent basis in normal/wet years. Subtracting 118,542 afa of current and committed demands will leave 17,358 afa of uncommitted raw water delivery capacity available for new development once the permanent American River pump station is complete in 2007.

### *Raw Water Delivery with Proposed Sacramento River Diversion Facilities*

Because of environmental concerns, PCWA has agreed in the Water Forum Agreement, dated January 2000, to limit PCWA's diversions from the American River to 35,500 afa, provided PCWA is able to obtain a diversion off the Sacramento River for the remainder of its MFP and/or CVP water not delivered off the American River.

PCWA is studying the feasibility of a project in which a new treatment plant would serve proposed developments in southwest Placer County with water diverted from the Sacramento River north of the Sacramento Airport. The project would provide an additional 35,000 afa of raw water supply, and 65 million gallons per day (mgd) of treatment capacity into PCWA service area. In 2001, Congress authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to complete a feasibility study and EIS/EIR on the project. If the project is approved, PCWA anticipates construction of the project could be completed by about 2015.



Completion of both the permanent American River Pump Station and the Sacramento River Diversion facilities would increase the amount of surface water available to PCWA's west Placer service area to 175,900 afa and should enable PCWA to meet the projected increase in the raw water delivery needs of its service area in western Placer County until 2030.

#### Water Treatment

PCWA completed the most recent expansion of its Foothill Water Treatment Plant (WTP) in Newcastle in 2005. The treatment plant capacity of this facility is 55 mgd. Combined with the Sunset WTP, which has a capacity of 8 mgd, the Foothill/Sunset system has a treatment capacity of 63 mgd. In 2005, the maximum day treatment plant demand for the Foothill/Sunset system was 50 mgd, which leaves 13 mgd of unused capacity that is available to serve new demands. PCWA reserves capacity for new customers upon payment of PCWA's Water Connection Charge (WCC). The annual growth in demand in PCWA's Foothill/Sunset system over the past three years has been about 3.0 mgd per year.

In addition, PCWA is in the design phase for a new water treatment plant that will be located on Ophir Road in the Newcastle/Ophir area. This plant is scheduled for completion in 2008. The new plant is being designed with a capacity of 30 mgd. When complete, this facility will be able to serve an additional 26,000 EDUs.

#### Water Transmission

PCWA completed construction of a 42-inch diameter treated water transmission line between Penryn and Lincoln in the fall of 2002. PCWA's transmission capacity is now equal to its treatment capacity in the Foothill/Sunset system serving Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln and surrounding County jurisdiction areas. A new treated water transmission pipeline is being designed to convey water from the Ophir area plant to the existing Foothill/Sunset system at Penryn and to areas near the City of Lincoln.

#### Water Storage

PCWA completed a new 10 million gallon tank near the Sunset WTP in 2001, increasing the storage capacity of the Foothill/Sunset system to 30 million gallons.

#### **Wastewater and Sewage Treatment**

The South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD), through its membership in the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA), provides wastewater treatment for the City of Rocklin. SPMUD's 1986 Sewer Master Plan envisioned that Rocklin would have 52,604 sewer equivalent dwelling units within the City at ultimate buildout, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on this projection. The City of Rocklin is expected to contain 27,400 housing units at buildout as well as industrial, commercial

and retail development. SPMUD has planned for growth in Rocklin, and the City does not need to take actions to ensure the availability of sewer infrastructure.

The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant provides wastewater treatment facilities for the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Loomis and the surrounding unincorporated areas. The SPWA has recently constructed an additional regional wastewater treatment facility, the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. SPMUD has indicated it would be able to serve the City of Rocklin's future wastewater treatment needs during the five-year program strategy for the 2002-2007 planning period.

#### Proposed Off-Site Sewer Extension

The Clover Valley project site is not currently served by wastewater conveyance infrastructure. The nearest off-site sewer line is the SPMUD's 15-inch Clover Valley trunk line that stubs into this project site at the terminus of Rawhide Road in the Clover Valley Woods subdivision. SPMUD has indicated that an additional 180 residential units could be accommodated by the existing system, to which the applicant could connect. However, because the proposed project includes 558 residential units, a 5.0-acre commercial site and a 5.3-acre park site, the project applicant would be required to construct an off-site sewer extension to accommodate project site wastewater flows exceeding the existing capacity.

From the project site's southern boundary, the existing 15-inch sewer line in Rawhide Road extends south to Dry Gulch Court where the line connects to an 8-inch sewer line. This 8-inch line continues southerly within Midas Avenue and turns westerly within Argonaut Avenue, then increases to a 10-inch line just west of Kennedy Court and continues to the vicinity of Union Street. The line traverses Union Street, cuts between two existing houses, then turns south across Sunset Whitney Country Club property to connect into an existing 18-inch trunk sewer line. This line ultimately connects to a 42-inch interceptor that flows into the City of Roseville system and then connects to the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The SPMUD Master Plan indicates that ultimate buildout of the Clover Valley watershed, including the northern Clover Valley properties, would require the upsizing of the existing 8-inch line south of the project area. The existing 8-inch line and the proposed alignment of a new 12-inch line under Rawhide Road is along Midas Avenue and through the Sunset Whitney Country Club. SPMUD would be the authority for the contracting, construction, operation and maintenance of this new 12-inch sewer line. Due to the potential width of the proposed trench, the possibility exists that the construction of the proposed sewer line may also require Rawhide Road and Midas Avenue to receive a new asphalt overlay.

The proposed off-site sewer line required for the buildout of the Clover Valley area has been designed by Stantec Consulting, Inc., the project applicant's engineer. Stantec's design has included several options for construction which are shown in Figures 4.12-1 through 4.12-8. A summary of the off-site sewer improvements is provided below.

*Section 1 – Rawhide to Midas (Shown in Figures 4.12-1 and 4.12-2)*

Beginning at the intersection of Rawhide Road and Dry Gulch Court, a new 12-inch sewer line would be installed within Rawhide's street rights-of-way to the vicinity of Clover Valley Park. At the park, two alignment options exist: cross through the park in a manner similar to the existing sewer line system (Option 1A) or to continue in Rawhide to its intersection at Midas Avenue, then turn east of Midas (Option 1B).

*Section 2 – Clover Valley Park to Argonaut Avenue (Shown in Figures 4.12-3 and 4.12-4)*

From the intersection of Midas Avenue and Clover Valley Road, Section 2 would continue southeast on Midas Avenue to Argonaut Avenue, then turn southwest to cross with Clover Valley Creek. On Midas Avenue, north of the Mountain View Drive intersection, either a 12-inch gravity lateral (Option 2A) or a 6-inch force main (Option 2B) would be installed in the street.

*Section 3 – Argonaut Avenue to the 18-inch Trunk Line (Shown in Figures 4.12-5 through 4.12-8)*

The terminus of Section 2 would be located where Argonaut Avenue crosses over a large culvert that contains Clover Valley Creek and the golf cart path, between existing residences on Argonaut Avenue. At this point, Section 3 would mark the southwesterly course of a new 12-inch sewer line, with options for gravity sewer or force main alignments. Option 3A would propose a 12-inch gravity lateral parallel to Argonaut, and Option 3B would install the 12-inch gravity lateral in the street. A 6-inch force main would also be proposed parallel to Argonaut (Option 3C), as would a 6-inch force main in the street (Option 3D).

Construction Activities

Construction activities related to the installation of the proposed sewer extension would occur on existing residential streets, including Rawhide, Midas, Argonaut and Union, adjacent to or near the proposed Clover Valley site. First, the existing paved street would have its pavement removed by being sawed to form a 6- to 8-foot-wide strip down the street. Wastewater from construction associated with the saw-cutting operations shall be prevented from entering the storm drain system through implementation of BMPs to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. The cut pavement would be picked up by backhoe and placed in a truck to be hauled away for disposal at a location approved by SPMUD and/or the City. The 6- to 8-foot-wide trench, constructed with appropriate trench shoring, would next be excavated downward about 8-to-12 feet, with that earth material also being trucked away and dumped at a location approved by SPMUD and/or the City. Then, 6- to 20-foot sections of 12-inch concrete pipe would be lowered into the trench, after which the trench would be back-filled with sand/gravel material trucked to the site. The back-fill material would be compacted by a roller and a temporary asphalt cover would be placed over the trench. Finally, after the installation of the sewer pipe is completed, either the trench would be repaved to match the existing street pavement, or the street may be entirely repaved. Typically, this construction process would be

performed in segments, such that throughout the duration of the project, trenching, pipe-laying, and backfill activities would only occur along one portion of the entire alignment at any given time. Access to all residential properties would also be maintained during construction. Metal plates would be supplied to work crews to lay over any open trenches should immediate vehicular access be mandatory. Plates would be installed nightly to cover the open trenches as well. The maximum length of open trenching allowed to be covered by plates overnight is 20 feet.

During the excavation of the trench, rock may be uncovered which blocks further excavation and may require blasting. Blasting is a common occurrence in Rocklin and is permitted upon approval of the City of Rocklin. To contain flying rock particles in the blasting area, blast-blankets would be used.

The construction equipment would occupy the street during installation activities, and would be kept at the construction site overnight and during weekends. A designated staging area could also be established at a site approved by the City, where future pipe and construction materials would be stored during the installation of the new sewer extension.

It should be noted that specific environmental impacts from the construction of the off-site sewer line are discussed in Chapter 4.2, Land Use; Chapter 4.4, Transportation and Circulation; Chapter 4.5, Air Quality, Chapter 4.6, Noise; Chapter 4.7, Cultural Resources, Chapter 4.8, Biological Resources; Chapter 4.9, Geology; and Chapter 4.11, Hydrology and Water Quality of this Draft EIR.

### **Solid Waste Collection/Disposal and Recycling**

Solid waste pickup service is not currently provided to the project site. Under contract with the City of Rocklin, the Auburn Placer Disposal Service would provide residential service on a weekly pickup basis within the project site. The Western Regional Sanitary Landfill ('Nortech Landfill') would provide solid waste management for the proposed project. The Nortech Landfill is owned by and operated by a joint powers authority called the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA). Placer County and the cities of Rocklin, Roseville and Lincoln formed the Authority to provide adequate disposal facilities for each of their jurisdictions. The landfill is Class III facility which opened in 1979 and accepts standard municipal solid waste. The landfill is located southwest of the City of Lincoln.

The City of Rocklin prepared a Source Reduction and Recycling Element in 1995 in response to a State mandate that set a solid waste diversion goal of 50 percent for the year 2000. As of 2002, the City's diversion rate was 52 percent, due in part to the success of the green waste collection program that was initiated by the City. The City has also partnered with Placer County and neighboring jurisdictions to become designated as a Recycling Market Development Zone, offering economic incentives to new businesses using post-consumer waste materials within the zone.

## **Law Enforcement**

The Rocklin planning area is provided law enforcement by the Rocklin Police Department, the Placer County Sheriff's Department, and the California Highway Patrol. Within the City limits, the Police Department provides full law enforcement services.

### Rocklin Police Department

The department currently employs approximately 70 full-time personnel, 15 reserve police officers, and a large contingent of citizen volunteers. The basic goal of the department is to provide 1.2 sworn in officers per 1000 people. Prior to January 2005, operations and patrol were conducted out of the Fire Department headquarters located at 4060 Rocklin Road. In January 2005, a new 43,000 square-foot police station was completed at 4080 Rocklin Road.

### Placer County Sheriff Department

The Placer County Sheriff's Department provides County Coroner's services and serves legal papers throughout the county.

### California Highway Patrol (CHP)

The closest California Highway Patrol (CHP) station is located north of Rocklin in Newcastle. When necessary, the CHP provides back-up services to the Rocklin Police Department and the Placer County Sheriff's Department.

## **Fire Protection and Emergency Response**

Fire prevention, suppression, emergency medical, and technical rescue services are provided by the City of Rocklin Fire Department. In addition to emergency response and rescue, the Department must maintain the fire stations, fire apparatus, and water systems essential for fighting fires in the community.

In addition, Rocklin belongs to a statewide mutual aid system, through which fire suppression assistance is provided to a member agency requesting assistance when it has exhausted its own resources and needs assistance. Bordering fire jurisdictions participate with Rocklin in the statewide mutual aid system.

### Rocklin Fire Department

The Rocklin Fire Department provides fire protection services in the City of Rocklin. The Rocklin Fire Department is currently staffed with 36 full-time line personnel, including a Fire Chief, five Battalion Chiefs, nine Captains, nine driver operators/engineers, and nine firefighters. In addition, the Department has an Administrative Secretary, one Administrative Clerk, two Fire Inspectors, nine Apprentice Firefighters, and a complement of Volunteer firefighters available. The Department's goal is to maintain a

ratio of one employee per 1,000 residents. The Department includes its apprentices and non-line personnel in this computation. The Department currently has an Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating of 3. ISO ratings range from 1 to 10, with 1 being the best rating.

Two fire stations are located in the City of Rocklin. Fire Station No. 1 is located at 4060 Rocklin Road and Fire Station No. 2 is located at 3401 Crest Drive. A third station, to serve the northwest portion of the City, was recently opened at the northeast corner of Liberty Parkway and West Stanford Ranch Road (2001 Liberty Parkway). A fourth station is now in the planning stage at the future intersection of Park Drive and Clover Valley Parkway.

While the major fire threat in the City is related to urban development, annexations in the early 1990s brought land into the City that contains large areas of grassland and is subject to a threat of wildfire. These areas include Clover Valley, areas at the southern end of China Garden Road, portions of Whitney Oaks, the Croftwood/Dias Lane area, Sunset Ranchos, open-space easements, and recreational properties.

The City has adopted the Uniform Fire Code as part of its building regulations. The Code governs the fire safety requirements in building and construction (Rocklin Municipal Code, Chapter 15.04).

#### *Response Times*

The Fire Department responds to a variety of emergency situations in the community. The total number of responses during 2003 was approximately four percent higher than in the previous calendar year. In the past four years, the Department has experienced an average of 11.5 percent increase in the number of our total responses. The Department's response time is the time interval that elapses from the time a call for assistance is received until the first unit is on the scene. The Fire Department currently averages a five-minute or less response time 80 percent of the time.

#### Emergency Medical Services

American Medical Response (AMR) serves the City with ambulance services, and maintains response times under ten minutes for the majority of calls. AMR serves western Placer County and strategically locates ambulances throughout the region, including within the City of Rocklin.

#### **Parks and Recreational Facilities**

The City currently owns 29 parks totaling 366 acres, including 155+/- improved acres. The City currently has 24 full or partially developed parks (three community parks, 21 neighborhood parks) and five unimproved sites. An additional eight parks (one community park and seven neighborhood parks) totaling an estimated 75+/- acres are projected in future developments. At build-out the City is anticipated to operate 37 parks totaling an estimated 440 +/- acres. The Rocklin Unified School District (RUSD)

operates nine elementary schools, two middle schools, and Rocklin High School. RUSD provides additional recreational field space and open space within the City.

The City of Rocklin Community Services & Facilities Department develops, maintains, and operates all City-owned park and recreation facilities. The City of Rocklin has a City Council-appointed Recreation Commission. The Commission serves as an advisory board to the City Council on matters including parkland acquisition, design and development, and recreation programs and activities. The City's Community Services and Facilities Department is staffed by a director and administrative secretary and has two operational divisions: Recreation and Parks/Facilities. The Recreation Division is managed by a recreation superintendent and includes 34 full-time staff positions, numerous part-time staff, and contract instructors and volunteers. The Parks/Facilities Division is managed by the parks and facilities operations manager and includes 22 full-time staff positions, seasonal part-time workers, and small projects contracts.

The City has adopted standards for the location, design and use of City parks. These standards are related to the designation of the park as follows:

- Neighborhood park: 1-10 acres in size, serving a radius of up to ½ mile. Typical improvements may include but are not limited to preschool and school-aged playgrounds, (unlighted) open turf fields, pathways, basketball court, sand volleyball court, small covered picnic area, and open space areas.
- Community park: 10+ acres in size, 1- to 2-mile radius. Improvements may include but are not limited to lighted baseball, softball, soccer, and multi-use fields, community centers and other recreation buildings, large group picnic areas, pathways, preschool and school-aged playgrounds, off street parking, aquatics centers, restrooms, and other large or heavy-use recreation facilities. Community parks may also have large areas of undeveloped open space that may include oak tree groves and creeks.
- Special use park: No specific size or service area, but designed for single purpose recreational activities such as golf courses, nature centers, or display gardens.

## **Schools**

The project site is bisected by the boundary of two separate elementary and high school districts. The southern portion of the site is within the Rocklin Unified Elementary School and High School District. The northern portion of the site is within the Loomis Union School District and the Placer Union High School District. Students residing within the project site would attend either Franklin or Placer Elementary. As described in further detail below, Rocklin Union School District is operating below capacity. Loomis Union and Placer Joint Union are currently operating at or above capacity.

<b>Table 4.12-4 School District Existing + Project Enrollment</b>					
<b>School District</b>	<b>Current Enrollment</b>	<b>Design Capacity</b>	<b>Existing % Over Capacity</b>	<b>Project Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>% Over Capacity W/Full Project Buildout</b>
<b>Loomis Union District<sup>2</sup></b>					
K-8	1,892	1,884	0.4%	159	9%
<b>Placer Joint Union District<sup>2</sup></b>					
9-12	4,743	3,976 <sup>3</sup>	19%	70	21%
<b>Rocklin Unified District<sup>4</sup></b>					
K-6	4,880	5,475	N/A	95	N/A
7-8	1,565	1,600	N/A	24	N/A
9-12	2,951	4,000	N/A	36	N/A
Notes:					
1. These figures are based on a rough estimate of 320 housing units within the Loomis Union District and Placer Joint Union District, and 238 units in the Rocklin Unified District.					
Sources:					
2. California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, Accessed and prepared December 28, 2005. <a href="http://data1.cde.ca.gov/">http://data1.cde.ca.gov/</a>					
3. Placer Union High School District, April 2004; provided by Cathy Allen, Director of Facilities and Operations, Placer County Office of Education, December 29, 2005.					
4. Larry Stark, Assistant Superintendent, Rocklin Unified School. Phone and e-mail to Jessica Hankins, December 8, 2005.					

Table 4.12-5 details the Rocklin K-12 student generation ratio, and Table 4.12-6 details the Placer and Loomis K-12 student generation ratio.

<b>Table 4.12-5 Rocklin Student Generation Ratio</b>	
<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Generation Ratio</b>
K-6	0.44
7-8	0.11
9-12	0.65
Source: Larry Stark, Assistant Superintendent, Rocklin Unified School District, October 26, 2005;	

<b>Table 4.12-6 Loomis and Placer Student Generation Ratio</b>	
<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Generation Ratio</b>
K-6	0.34
7-8	0.16
9-12	0.22
Source: Cathy Allen, Director of Facilities and Operations, Placer County Office of Education, December 7, 2005.	



Rocklin Unified School District

The District completed a *Facilities Master Plan* in February 2000. School capacity is a key component in determining new facility requirements. When enrollment meets or exceeds capacity of existing schools, construction or expansion of the facilities will be needed.

Two different measures of capacity are used in the RUSD: design capacity and maximum capacity. Design capacity is the desired enrollment at a school to optimize the delivery of the education program and meet the District goals for a safe and secure environment. The maximum capacity is the greatest number of students that a school can accommodate by most efficiently using its facilities and adding the maximum allowable number of portable classrooms (RUSD *Facilities Master Plan*, 2000). Existing capacity is the capacity of the facility at the time of the preparation of the *Facilities Master Plan*. Current enrollment projections are presented in Table 4.12-7.

<b>Table 4.12-7</b>					
<b>Rocklin Unified School District</b>					
<b>Enrollment Projections – Moderate and Fast Growth</b>					
<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>1999/2000 Enrollment</b>	<b>2004/05 Enrollment Projection</b>		<b>2014/15 Enrollment Projection</b>	
		<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Fast</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Fast</b>
K-6	3,853	5,001	5,419	6,527	7,096
7-8	1,096	1,422	1,541	1,856	2,018
9-12	1,929	2,468	2,674	3,120	3,391
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,878</b>	<b>8,891</b>	<b>9,634</b>	<b>11,503</b>	<b>12,505</b>
Source: Rocklin Unified School District, Rocklin Unified School District Facilities Master Plan, 2000.					

*Elementary Schools*

The RUSD Master Plan states that in addition to the six (now eight) existing elementary schools, eight new elementary school sites proposed throughout the District (two are now occupied by new schools: Valley View and Sierra Elementary). The District has a design capacity norm for elementary schools of 600 students per site. The RUSD *Facilities Master Plan* projected 2014/15 total enrollment of K-6 students ranges from 6,527 to 7,096.

*Middle Schools*

The District’s middle schools have a design capacity norm of 800 students per site. The total projected 2014/15 enrollment of grade 7-8 students ranges from 1,856 to 2018. New middle schools are not anticipated in the District’s *Facilities Master Plan*.

*High Schools*

The District’s High School has a design capacity of 2,000 and a maximum capacity of 2,400 students (if portables were to be added). The total projected 2014/15 enrollment for grade 9-12 students ranges from 3,120 to 3,391. The District is currently addressing the

issues of anticipated future overcrowding through an evaluation of alternatives to increase maximum school capacity, construction of a new high school facility, and other alternatives, such as alternative schedules or use of other sites, to increase student capacity. A second high school has been developed and is in use within the Sunset Ranchos area.

#### Loomis Union School District

A portion of the Rocklin planning area is also served by the Loomis Union School District, primarily the Croftwood area and Clover Valley along the eastern edge of Rocklin. More specifically these areas are situated east of Sierra College Boulevard, south of Pacific Street, and east of Del Mar Avenue, north of Pacific Street. The Loomis Union School District currently operates three K-8 elementary schools and one K-5 elementary school: Loomis (3505 Taylor Road), Franklin (7050 Franklin School Road), Placer (8650 Horseshoe Bar Road), and H. Clarke Powers (3296 Humphrey Road). The H. Clarke Powers Elementary School currently supports grades K-5, with a grade level added each year. Eventually this school will support grades K-8 as well. During the 2004-2005 academic school year, the enrollment numbers at the schools according to the California Department of Education were 399, 587, 495, and 411 respectively, for a total enrollment in the district of 1,892 students (<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>). Within the area served by the Loomis Union School District, students within the Rocklin area north of I-80 attend H. Clarke Powers Elementary School. Those south of I-80 within the Loomis Union School District attend Franklin Elementary School. Sixth graders within the H. Clarke Powers service area are distributed among the other elementary schools at this time.

Students within the Loomis Union Elementary School District attend Del Oro High School (3301 Taylor Road), which is part of the Placer Union High School District. According to the California Department of Education (<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>), during the 2004-2005 academic school year, enrollment at Del Oro High School was 1,599 students.

#### Placer Union High School District

The Placer Union High School District encompasses approximately 900 square miles in Placer County. The District has served the communities of Loomis, Penryn, Newcastle, Ophir, Auburn, Bowman, Christian Valley, Meadow Vista, Applegate, Weimar, Foresthill, Colfax, Dutch Flat, and Alta for over 100 years. The schools of the District enroll approximately 4,800 students, grades 9-12. The Placer School for Adults serves 6,000 adults a year. A recently completed master plan, prepared by community members, business leaders, and staff, recommends the District continue to maintain small high schools in a community setting.

### Higher Education

Opportunities for higher education in the City of Rocklin are provided by both public and private colleges and universities including Sierra College, California State University Sacramento, CSU Sacramento College of Continuing Education, UC Davis, University of Southern California, University of San Francisco, and William Jessup University.

Sierra College is a fully accredited, two-year community college serving Placer, Nevada and portions of El Dorado and Sacramento counties. The main campus is located on Sierra College Boulevard south of Interstate 80. Other facilities operated by the College include a 115-acre Nevada County campus in Grass Valley, a campus center in North Tahoe/Truckee, training facilities in Loomis, and a satellite center in Roseville. The current enrollment of the College is over 18,000 with approximately 13,000 students attending the Rocklin campus. Sierra College offers a wide range of opportunities including: Associate in Arts (AA) or Associate in Science (AS) Degrees, certificate programs, first two years of pre-professional programs, and guaranteed transfer to four-year colleges and universities.

### School Operations

The school districts are separate governmental entities, and the City has no direct role in the operation of the schools. State law currently provides that the environmental impacts of new development on local school facilities are mitigated when developers pay the required school fees. Currently, serious limits hamper the ability of the City to influence provision of school facilities, at least through 2006 when the current law “sunsets.”

### State Funding Sources

The major State funding program for providing permanent school facilities is the School Facility Program (SFP), created by the passage of Senate Bill 50 and Proposition 1A in 1998 and administered by the State Office of New Public School Construction. The SFP changes the way school districts can levy developer fees. SB 50 enables the district to collect additional fees in an amount that would approximate 50 percent of the cost of additional facilities. The collection of the 50 percent mitigation fees is based on the assumption that the State School Facility funding program remains intact and that State funds are still available for partial funding of new school facilities. If the funds are not available, districts may collect up to 100 percent mitigation fees under certain circumstances. In addition, a statewide formula determines the required 20 percent local contribution or “match” to State funds for the renovation of older schools.

Within the SFP, Assembly Bill (AB 16) was approved in 2002 to establish the Critically Overcrowded School Facilities (COS) program, which supplements the new construction provisions within the School Facilities Program. The COS program allows school districts with critically overcrowded school facilities, as determined by the California Department of Education, to apply for a preliminary apportionment for new construction projects. With the adoption of Proposition 55 in March 2004, an additional \$2.44 billion

in funding became available for the COS program. Levels of developer fee contribution are determined by the State Allocation Board and increase annually. Current State statutes dictate that school districts have the authority to levy fees (known as statutory or Level I fees) on new development at rates of \$2.14 per square foot of new residential and \$0.34 per square foot for commercial and industrial development.

Because these Level I fees often do not generate sufficient funding for new schools, some districts use fees (known as Level II fees) to generate one-half the cost of providing new school facilities. Use of Level II fees assumes that the State would provide the other half of the cost of new schools through the issuance of general obligation bonds. In the event that the State does not have funding available, participating districts have the option to temporarily increase the fees (then known as Level III fees) on new residential developments to attempt to meet their needs. However, the district must refund these funds when general obligation funds from the State become available. Some income for school districts is obtained through the State lottery but this income cannot be used for funding construction projects due to the fluctuating funding levels available.

## **Libraries**

Library services in Rocklin are provided by the Auburn-Placer County Library District, which was formed in 1967 with the consolidation of Auburn Public Library and the Placer County Library. This system of libraries serves all of Placer County with the exception of the Cities of Roseville and Lincoln, which own and operate their own municipal library systems.

The Auburn-Placer County Library District operates a main branch in the City of Auburn, a law library, children's programs, nine branch libraries and a mobile service that serves many areas throughout rural Placer County. The Rocklin Community Library has a community room available to the public for meetings.

The *Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan*, adopted in 1991, projects facilities needed to serve the existing and future population, but the Long-Range Plan is currently in the process of being updated. Several critical changes in library utilization have occurred since the 1991 Long-Range Plan was adopted, including additional space requirements necessitated by the Americans with Disabilities Act and the use of computer workstations in the library, each of which requires additional space. According to Mark Parker<sup>3</sup>, the Director of Library Services for the Auburn-Placer County Library District, the current serve goal as identified by the Board of Supervisors in the Facilities Master Plan and Public Services Master Plan is 0.4 square feet per person in a given service area, as well as one computer per 1,000 population. Per Mr. Parker, current library area provided in the vicinity of the project site includes approximately 500 square feet in Penryn, 3,712 square feet in Loomis (which will be expanded to 4,500 square feet before June 2006), and 7,800 square feet in Rocklin.

## **Electrical and Natural Gas**

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electrical and natural gas services to the City of Rocklin and is required by the State Public Utilities Commission to update the systems to meet any additional demand. Three electric substations supply the Rocklin area distribution electric load. These substations are Rocklin Substation, located on South Grove Street, Del Mar Substation located on Yard Road off Sierra Meadows Drive, and Pleasant Grove Substation located northwest of Rocklin on the west side of State Route 65 and north of Sunset Boulevard. An 115,000-volt transmission line runs northeast along Taylor Road, east over Evelyn Avenue and Kanasto Street to Grove Street, then north up Grove Street to Taylor, then northeast along Taylor Road to the city limits near Pacific Street. Another 115,000-volt transmission line runs along State Route 65 to a point just south of the Roseville City limits.

As noted above, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) is obligated by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rule 15 to extend services to all new developments. PG&E is not required to distribute the services throughout the project site, but is only responsible for getting the electricity to the project site.

Natural gas service is provided by PG&E. A 12-inch transmission line traverses the planning area starting at State Route 65 at the Roseville City limits, and then moving east to Sunset Boulevard. The transmission line then downsizes to an eight-inch transmission line and follows Whitney Boulevard, Argonaut Avenue, Mountain View, and Taylor Road, then travels northeast along Taylor Road to the city limits.

### Distributions Facilities

PG&E provides underground electric service within all new subdivisions. However, the construction, or reconstruction, of overhead distribution facilities is periodically required to supply the underground circuits within the new developments. Overhead electric transmission facilities presently exist within the City of Rocklin. New electric transmission facilities would be needed to serve the expanding electric needs of the City. PG&E builds infrastructure on an as-needed basis. The City of Rocklin is currently working with PG&E and the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to design and locate a major high voltage transmission line (115Kv) corridor through Rocklin. The preferred PG&E route would locate the line along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way between the Roseville city limits and Sierra Meadows Drive to the Delmar substation. Because high voltage transmission lines at this location would pose an aesthetic impact in Central Rocklin, the City, PG&E and the PUC have agreed that PG&E would underground that portion of the line proposed between Sunset Boulevard and Midas Avenue.

The City of Rocklin generally has control of how and where lines under 50 kilovolts are constructed, and currently requires undergrounding of such lines in new developments. For lines that are above 50Kv (such as the proposed 115Kv line through Central Rocklin), the City only has review and comment authority to the California PUC. PG&E

now requires the City or developer to pay the costs of reconstruction or replacement of overhead transmission facilities if needed to serve a specific new development.

### **Telecommunications**

Pacific Bell and SureWest Communications provide telephone service in the City of Rocklin. Cable television is provided by Boulder Ridge Cable Company, DBA Starstream Communications. Several providers, including SureWest Communications, Nextel, Cingular Wireless, Sprint PCS, Verizon Wireless and AT&T Wireless, provide wireless telecommunications. Infrastructure for telephone and cable is typically installed at the point of initial development. Wireless infrastructure is market-driven and is installed following initial buildout. Similar to electrical service, provision of telephone service is generally addressed by the providers in accordance with service demand in accordance with State Public Utilities Commission rules.

### **REGULATORY CONTEXT**

---

Existing policies, laws, and regulations that would apply to the proposed project are summarized below.

#### **Federal**

##### Clean Water Act (CWA) / National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (NPDES)

The CWA is the cornerstone of water quality protection in the United States. The statute employs a variety of regulatory and nonregulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutants discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters so that they can support "the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water." The CWA regulates discharges from "non-point source" and traditional "point source" facilities, such as municipal sewage plants and industrial facilities. The CWA makes it illegal to discharge pollutants from a point source to the waters of the United States. Section 402 of the Act creates the NPDES regulatory program. Point sources must obtain a discharge permit from the proper authority (usually a state, sometimes EPA, a tribe, or a territory). NPDES permits cover industrial and municipal discharges, discharges from storm sewer systems in larger cities, storm water associated with numerous kinds of industrial activity, runoff from construction sites disturbing more than one acre, mining operations, and animal feedlots and aquaculture facilities above certain thresholds. All so-called "indirect" dischargers are not required to obtain NPDES permits. An indirect discharger is one that sends its wastewater into a city sewer system, so it eventually goes to a sewage treatment plant (POTW). Though not regulated under NPDES, "indirect" discharges are covered by another CWA program, called pretreatment. "Indirect" dischargers send their wastewater into a city sewer system, which carries it to the municipal sewage treatment plant,

through which it passes before entering a surface water. Permit requirements for treatment are expressed as end-of-pipe conditions. This set of numbers reflects levels of three key parameters: (1) biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), (2) total suspended solids (TSS), and (3) pH acid/base balance. These levels can be achieved by well-operated sewage plants employing "secondary" treatment. Primary treatment involves screening and settling, while secondary treatment uses biological treatment in the form of "activated sludge."

### National Pretreatment Program

The National Pretreatment Program is a cooperative effort of federal, State, and local regulatory environmental agencies established to protect water quality. The program is designed to reduce the level of pollutants discharged by industry and other non-domestic wastewater sources into municipal sewer systems, and thereby, reduce the amount of pollutants released into the environment through wastewater. The objectives of the program are to protect the Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) from pollutants that may interfere with plant operation, to prevent pollutants that may pass through untreated from being introduced into the POTW, and to improve opportunities for the POTW to reuse wastewater and sludges that are generated. The term "pretreatment" refers to the requirement that non-domestic sources discharging wastewater to POTWs control their discharges, and meet limits established by EPA, the State or local authority on the amount of pollutants allowed to be discharged. The control of the pollutants may necessitate treatment prior to discharge to the POTW (therefore the term "pretreatment"). Limits may be met by the non-domestic source through pollution prevention techniques (product substitution recycle and reuse of materials) or treatment of the wastewater.

The Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), which was enacted in 1974, gives the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to set standards for contaminants in drinking water supplies. The SDWA was amended in 1986 and amended and reauthorized in 1996. For each of the 83 contaminants listed in the SDWA, the EPA sets a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique for contaminants in drinking water.

## **State**

### Water Planning - Urban Water Management Planning Act

In 1983, the California Legislature enacted the Urban Water Management Planning Act (Water Code Sections 10610 – 10656). The Act requires that every urban water supplier that provides water to 3,000 or more customers, or that provides over 3,000 acre-feet of water annually shall prepare and adopt an urban water management plan. The Act states that urban water suppliers should make every effort to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its water service sufficient to meet the needs of its various categories of customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The Act also states that the management of urban water demands and the efficient use of water shall be actively pursued to protect both the people of the State and their water resources.

## Water Quality – State Water Resources Control Board

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) manages all water rights and water quality issues in California under the terms of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (1969). The California Department of Health Services (DHS) has been granted primary enforcement responsibility for the SDWA (see above). Title 22 of the California Administrative Code establishes DHS authority and stipulates drinking water quality and monitoring standards. These standards are equal to or more stringent than the federal standards.

## Water Supply – SB 610/SB 221

Senate Bills 610 and 221, which took effect January 1, 2002, require, specific information about water availability be presented and considered by land use agencies during the processing of certain land use entitlement applications. SB 610 and SB 221 apply to projects that include more than 500 residential units.

### *SB 610*

SB 610 refers to numerous details that must be addressed in the water supply assessment, which are described in portions of the amended Water Code §10910:

- (d)(1) The assessment required by this section shall include an identification of any existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project, and a description of the quantities of water received in prior years by the public water system...under the existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts.
- (2) An identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts held by the public water system [...] shall be demonstrated by providing information related to all of the following: (A) Written contracts or other proof of entitlement to an identified water supply. (B) Copies of a capital outlay program for financing the delivery of a water supply that has been adopted by the public water system. (C) Federal, State, and local permits for construction of necessary infrastructure associated with delivering the water supply. (D) Any necessary regulatory approvals that are required in order to be able to convey or deliver the water supply.
- (e) If no water has been received in prior years by the public water system [...] under the existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts, the public water system [...] shall also include in its water supply assessment [...] an identification of the other public water systems or water service contract holders that



receive a water supply or have existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts, to the same source of water...

- (f) If a water supply for a proposed project includes groundwater, the following additional information shall be included in the water supply assessment:
- (1) A review of any information contained in the urban water management plan relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project.
  - (2) A description of any groundwater basin or basins from which the proposed project would be supplied. For those basins for which a court or the board has adjudicated the rights to pump groundwater, a copy of the order or decree adopted by the court or the board and a description of the amount of groundwater the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), has the legal right to pump under the order or decree. For basins that have not been adjudicated, information as to whether the department has identified the basin or basins as overdrafted or has projected that the basin will become overdrafted if present management conditions continue, in the most current bulletin of the department that characterizes the condition of the groundwater basin, and a detailed description by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), of the efforts being undertaken in the basin or basins to eliminate the long-term overdraft condition.
  - (3) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), for the past five years from any groundwater basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.
  - (4) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater that is projected to be pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), from any basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.

- (5) An analysis of the sufficiency of the groundwater from the basin or basins from which the proposed project will be supplied to meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project.

A water supply assessment shall not be required to include the information required by this paragraph if the public water system determines...that the sufficiency of groundwater necessary to meet the initial and project demand associated with the project was addressed in [its urban water management plan].

### *SB 221*

SB 221 requires supporting documentation of verification that sufficient water supplies are available for a project. SB 221 provides that in determining whether water supply is sufficient, the water agency shall consider a myriad of factors:

- (A) The availability of water supplies over a historical record of at least 20 years.
- (B) The applicability of an urban water shortage contingency analysis [...] that includes actions to be undertaken by the public water system in response to water supply shortages.
- (C) The reduction in water supply allocated to a specific water use sector pursuant to a resolution or ordinance adopted, or a contract entered into, by the public water system [...]
- (D) The amount of water that the water supplier can reasonably rely on receiving from other water supply projects, such as conjunctive use, reclaimed water, water conservation, and water transfer, including programs identified under federal, State, and local water initiatives such as CALFED and Colorado River tentative agreements [...]

If the water agency relies upon water supplies not then available to it, then the written verification must be based on the following elements, to the extent each is applicable:

- (1) Written contracts or other proof of valid rights to the identified water supply that identify the terms and conditions under which the water will be available to serve the proposed subdivision.
- (2) Copies of a capital outlay program for financing the delivery of a sufficient water supply that has been adopted by the applicable governing body.

- (3) Securing of applicable federal, State, or local permits for construction of necessary infrastructure associated with supplying a sufficient water supply.
- (4) Any necessary regulatory approvals that are required in order to be able to convey or deliver sufficient water supply to the subdivision.

If water supply for the proposed subdivision includes groundwater, the public water system shall also evaluate, based on substantial evidence, the extent to which it or the landowner has the right to extract the additional groundwater needed to supply the proposed subdivision.

The water agency's written verification must also "include a description, to the extent that data is reasonably available based on published records maintained by federal and State agencies, and public records of local agencies, of the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the proposed subdivision on the availability of water resources for agricultural and industrial uses within the public water system's service area that are not currently receiving water from the public water system but are utilizing the same sources of water." The water agency may rely upon a prior CEQA document for this analysis.

If the water agency determines that water supplies are insufficient, the local agency may override that decision. "The local agency may make a finding [based on substantial evidence], after consideration of the written verification by the applicable public water system, that additional water supplies not accounted for by the public water system are, or would be, available prior to completion of the subdivision that will satisfy the requirements of this section."

#### Energy - California Public Utility Commission

The California Public Utility Commission (PUC) regulates privately owned electric, telecommunications, natural gas, water and passenger transportation companies, in addition to household goods movers, and the safety of rail transit. Regarding underground gas and oil lines, the PUC passed GO 112-E, Rules Governing Design, Construction, Testing, Maintenance, and Operations of Utility Gas Gathering, Transmission, and Distribution Piping Systems.

#### Fire Services - Uniform Fire Code

The Uniform Fire Code contains regulations relating to construction, maintenance, and use of buildings. Topics addressed in the Code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-safety

requirements for new and existing buildings and the surrounding premises. The Code contains specialized technical regulations related to fire and life safety.

#### Fire Services - California Health and Safety Code

State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, include regulations for building standards (as also set forth in the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training.

#### Schools - California Code of Regulations

The California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Education Code, governs all aspects of education within the State.

#### Schools - Proposition 1A/Senate Bill 50

Proposition 1A/Senate Bill (SB) 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) is a school construction measure authorizing the expenditure of State bonds totaling \$9.2 billion through 2002, primarily for modernization and rehabilitation of older school facilities and construction of new school facilities. \$2.5 billion is for higher education facilities and \$6.7 billion is for K-12 facilities. Proposition 1A/SB 50 implemented significant fee reforms by amending the laws governing developer fees and school mitigation:

- Establishes the base (statutory) amount (indexed for inflation) of allowable developer fees at \$1.93 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.31 per square foot for commercial construction.
- Prohibits school districts, cities, and counties from imposing school impact mitigation fees or other requirements in excess of or in addition to those provided in the statute.
- Suspends for a period of at least eight years (2006) a series of court decisions allowing cities and counties to deny or condition development approvals on grounds of inadequate school facilities when acting on certain types of entitlements.

Proposition 1A/SB 50 prohibits local agencies from using the inadequacy of school facilities as a basis for denying or conditioning approvals of any “legislative or adjudicative act...involving ...the planning, use, or development of real property” (Government Code 65996(b)). Additionally, a local agency cannot require participation in a Mello-Roos for school facilities; however, the statutory fee is reduced by the amount of any voluntary participation in a Mello-Roos. Satisfaction of the Proposition 1A/SB 50 statutory requirements by a developer is deemed to be “full and complete mitigation.” The law identifies certain circumstances under which the statutory fee can be exceeded, including preparation and adoption of a “needs analysis,” eligibility for State funding, and satisfaction of two of four requirements (post-January 1, 2000) identified in the law

including year-round enrollment, general obligation bond measure on the ballot over the last four years that received 50 percent plus one of the votes cast, 20 percent of the classes in portable classrooms, or specified outstanding debt. Assuming a district qualifies for exceeding the statutory fee, the law establishes ultimate fee caps of 50 percent of costs where the State makes a 50 percent match, or 100 percent of costs where the State match is unavailable. District certification of payment of the applicable fee is required before the City or County can issue the building permit.

### Schools - Proposition 55

Proposition 55 is a school construction measure passed in 2004 authorizing the sale of approximately \$12.3 billion in bonds to fund qualified K-12 education facilities to relieve overcrowding and to repair older schools. Funds target areas of the greatest need and must be spent according to strict accountability measures. These bonds would be used only for eligible projects. Approximately ten billion dollars would be allocated to K-12 schools, with the remaining 2.3 billion allocated to higher education facilities.

### Schools - Department of Education Standards

The California Department of Education published the Guide to School Site Analysis and Development to establish a valid technique for determining acreage for new school development. Rather than assigning a strict student/acreage ratio, this guide provides flexible formulas that permit each district to tailor its ratios as necessary to accommodate its individual conditions. The Department of Education also recommends that a site utilization study be prepared for the site, based on these formulas.

## **Local**

### City of Rocklin General Plan

#### *Public Services and Facilities Element:*

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| Goal(s)  | To ensure that adequate public services and facilities are provided to meet the needs of residents of the City.  |
| Policy 1 | To maintain the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the existing areas of the City and to ensure that new development is served by a full range of public services.  |
| Policy 2 | To cooperate with school districts serving the City to meet their adopted district standards and State standards. All residential development project applications shall be evaluated for the impact on school services and facilities. Where an impact is found, the project may be conditioned to the extent and in the manner allowed by law, to mitigate the impact, such as requiring payment of school district fees and participation in a community facilities district to fund school facilities. |

- Policy 6 To require garbage collection services to ensure the maintenance of health standards.
- Policy 7 To maintain existing public services and provide new facilities consistent with community needs.
- Policy 8 To require developer participation in providing public services and facilities (including equipment) where development proceeds in advance of the City's ability to provide the services of facilities. Participation could consist of the formation of assessment districts, payment of fees, and/or the construction and dedication of facilities.
- Policy 14 To encourage the development of a centralized Civic Center in the vicinity of the existing City Hall.
- Policy 18 To encourage programs to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste materials to the extent possible.

### *Open Space, Conservation and Recreation*

- Goal(s): To designate, protect, and conserve natural resources, open space, and recreation lands in the City; and provide opportunities for recreational activities to meet citizen needs.
- Policy 5 To encourage energy conservation in new developments.
- Policy 7 To provide for recreational and park needs through any or all of the following: collection of park fees, dedication of parkland, rehabilitation of existing park and recreation facilities, installation of park improvements, and provision for operation and maintenance.
- Policy 8 To require dedication of park lands as a condition in the early stage of development process, including approval of rezonings, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of goals and policies contained in the General Plan.
- Policy 9 To provide park facilities in accordance with adopted park standards and phasing.
- Policy 10 To provide recreation programs that meet citizen needs, with an emphasis on self-supporting recreational facilities.
- Policy 12 To encourage the location of parks in areas not presently being served.
- Policy 13 To require new development to annex into the Park development and Maintenance District.
- Policy 14 To provide for the ongoing operation and maintenance of parkland through the City's Park Development and Maintenance District.
- Policy 17 To consider acquisition and development of small areas along creeks at convenient and safe locations for use by the general public.

Policy 18 To promote, where appropriate, the joint use of streams for flood control, open space, conservation of natural resources, and limited recreation.

*Community Safety Element:*

Goal(s): To minimize the danger of natural and man-made hazards and to protect residents and visitors from the danger of earthquake, fire, flood, other natural disasters, and man-made dangers.

Policy 10 To enforce the City building code, fire code, and City ordinances in regard to fire safety and fire protection.

## **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

### **Method of Analysis**

This section evaluates the project impacts on the existing utilities. In order to assist the impact discussion, the agencies and organizations responsible for the utilities were contacted.

### **Standards of Significance**

The proposed project would be considered to have a significant impact on the environment if the project would:

- Increase demand on existing water supply and distribution facilities, such that the facilities cannot meet the demand; or
- Adversely impact the wastewater delivery system and increase the wastewater capacity beyond the ability of the wastewater treatment plant; or
- Increase the demand for additional law enforcement or fire protection services beyond the ability of the existing departments to provide adequate service; or
- Increase the total number of students beyond the capacity of the local school districts; or
- Increase the demand for recreational uses beyond the existing or proposed parks and recreational facilities; or
- Exceed the available provisions of local solid waste disposal/recycling agencies; and
- Increase the demand for electrical, gas, and phone services beyond the ability to provide service.

## Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### 4.12I-1 Increased demand for water supply and/or water supply infrastructure.

#### Water Supply

The Placer County Water Agency indicates in their December 16, 2005 *SB 221 and SB 610 Analysis for Clover Valley Subdivision* that through the integrated use of existing surface water entitlements, recycled water and demand reduction resources and groundwater, adequate water supply is available to meet the anticipated build out demands of the Clover Valley project in addition to the rest of the buildout demands currently anticipated for 20 years within PCWA's projected service area in western Placer County in normal, single dry and multiple dry years. On December 5, 2005, the PCWA Board of Directors discussed and approved the City's request to provide water to the Clover Valley project.

However, depending upon the timing of the project and because PCWA has a first-come, first-serve policy for serving new customers, the completion of any or all of numerous PCWA-planned infrastructure projects may be required before PCWA can provide water service for the buildout of the Clover Valley project. Those projects include completion of the permanent American River Pump Station, which is currently under construction, and completion of additional treatment capacity and transmission facilities associated with PCWA's planned Ophir area water treatment plant project, which are currently under design.

PCWA estimated buildout water demand of the proposed project based on unit water demand values as contained in PCWA's most current Integrated Water Resources Plan. Surface availability is 136,879 acre-feet per year (see Table 4.12-2), and the buildout demand of the proposed project would be approximately 631 acre-feet per year; thus, a sufficient water supply currently exists. However, although the PCWA currently has sufficient water supply for the project and anticipates having sufficient water supplies for some time, delays in the project schedule could result in the need for one or more of the above improvements. The need for these improvements would be determined at the time of the applicant's fee submission and application to the PCWA, at which time the PCWA Board would make the determination to approve or not approve services to the site. Should the PCWA Board determine that adequate water supply does not exist to service the project, the project would not proceed until such a time when facilities improvements had been made to the satisfaction of the PCWA Board. Should the Board determine that adequate water supply and facilities exist to serve the site, the Board would accept the fees, approve the application, and guarantee water to serve the site.



The project applicant would be responsible for extending PCWA's existing transmission infrastructure to the project site and constructing the needed on-site infrastructure, including the potable water distribution system.

### Water Treatment

As a planning estimate, PCWA uses 1,150 gallons per day per dwelling unit as the estimated average peak-day potable water demand for residential development. Brian Martin, Technical Services Director for PCWA, approximates that during peak water use, commercial uses utilize approximately 5,518 gallons per day per acre, and park uses utilize approximately 10,502 gallons per day per acre<sup>4</sup>). With 558 proposed single-family residential units, project residents would use approximately 641,700 gallons per day during peak water use times. The proposed 5.0 acres of commercial uses would utilize approximately 27,590 gallons per day during peak water use times. The proposed 5.3 acres of park uses would utilize approximately 55,661 gallons per day during peak water use times. The proposed project uses would thus utilize approximately 724,951 gallons per day during peak water use.

According to the State Department of Finance, as of January 1, 2005 Rocklin had 19,679 housing units. If each household were to use 1,150 gallons per day (peak), 22.63 million gallons per day (mgd) of treated water per day would be needed during peak water use times. (Data for commercial and park uses were not available at the time of this analysis.) The project's residential, commercial, and park uses would bring the total to approximately 23.35 mgd (724,951 gallons per day = approximately 0.72 mgd). As noted previously, PCWA completed the most recent expansion of its Foothill Water Treatment Plant (WTP) in Newcastle in 2005. The treatment plant capacity of this facility is 55 mgd. Combined with the Sunset WTP, which has a capacity of 8 mgd, the Foothill/Sunset system has a treatment capacity of 63 mgd. In 2005, the maximum day treatment plant demand for the Foothill/Sunset system was 50 mgd, which leaves 13 mgd of unused capacity that is available to serve new demands. Thus, even with additional future commercial, park, and other uses which could require water treatment, water treatment capacity is currently more than sufficient for existing uses; additionally, with 13 mgd of unused capacity available to serve new demands, the treatment plant would be capable of treating the additional 0.72 mgd needed by the proposed project.

### Water Transmission

As noted previously, PCWA's transmission capacity is equal to its treatment capacity in the Foothill/Sunset system serving Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln and surrounding County jurisdiction areas.

### Conclusion

Because the PCWA has approved the request to supply water to the project site and determined that an adequate supply of water exists to serve the proposed project, and because adequate facilities would exist to serve the project, impacts related to water supply are considered *less-than-significant*.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-2 Increased demand for wastewater disposal and conveyance.**

The proposed project would include the construction of an off-site sanitary sewer extension to ensure that the project is provided with adequate wastewater conveyance capacity. As noted previously, the specific environmental impacts resulting from construction of the off-site sewer line are discussed separately in the relevant environmental chapters of this Draft EIR.

The South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD), through its membership in the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA), provides wastewater treatment for the City of Rocklin. SPMUD's 1986 Sewer Master Plan envisioned that Rocklin would have 52,604 sewered equivalent dwelling units within the City at ultimate buildout, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on this projection. The City of Rocklin is expected to contain 27,400 housing units at buildout as well as industrial, commercial and retail development. SPMUD has planned for growth in Rocklin, and the City does not need to take actions to ensure the availability of sewer infrastructure.

The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant provides wastewater treatment facilities for the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Loomis and the surrounding unincorporated areas. The SPWA has recently constructed an additional regional wastewater treatment facility, the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. SPMUD has indicated it would be able to serve the City of Rocklin's future wastewater treatment needs during the five-year program strategy for the 2002-2007 planning period (City of Rocklin Draft General Plan, Public Services and Facilities, p 4F-5). Therefore, the project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts to wastewater treatment.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-3 Increased demand for solid waste disposal/recycling services.**

The Western Regional Sanitary Landfill ('Nortech Landfill'), operated by the WPWMA, is located near State Route 65 between the cities of Roseville and

Lincoln. Environmental Resource Specialist Tom Carmichael of Placer County Solid Waste<sup>5</sup> has indicated that the landfill has a permitted area of 281 acres and a disposal area of 231 acres. Additionally, WPWMA owns approximately 450 acres for expansion on the west side of Fiddymont Road. This potential expansion area has a conditional permit for potential future uses and is dedicated for future landfill uses, but does not currently hold solid waste permits.

Mr. Carmichael further indicated that the landfill's current permit allows a design capacity of 36,350,000 cubic yards. The landfill is currently approximately 40 percent full. The landfill is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day and is currently accepting an average of 900 to 1,000 tons per day (900 tons on weekends, 1,000 average on weekdays). The current landfill is anticipated to serve the Western Placer Waste Management Authority through 2036; however, the ability of the Western Regional Landfill to accept solid waste in the future would ultimately depend on population growth rates in the South Placer area. As noted above, the 450-acre site located across the street could be used for future expansion.

The City of Rocklin prepared a Source Reduction and Recycling Element in 1995 in response to a State mandate that set a solid waste diversion goal of 50 percent for the year 2000. As of 2002, the City's diversion rate was 52 percent, due in part to the success of the green waste collection program that was initiated by the City.

The City has also partnered with Placer County and neighboring jurisdictions to become designated as a Recycling Market Development Zone, offering economic incentives to new businesses using post-consumer waste materials within the zone.

Federal and State regulations regarding solid waste consist of EPA regulations and the California Integrated Waste Management Act regulating waste reduction. These regulations primarily affect local agencies and other agencies such as the WPWMA. Direct federal and State laws do not exist which the project must comply with. However, the project would comply with local regulations regarding trash and other nuisance-related issues. Solid waste management was discussed previously in the Clover Valley Lakes Annexation EIR (p. R-2):

Implementation of the proposed project will generate various types of solid waste both during construction and after completion of the project. Solid waste generated during construction activity will include demolition debris from the existing residence on site, which could include asbestos, and also asphalt, cement, wood products, plastics, corrugated cardboard and scrap metal. The amount of solid waste expected to require landfilling from construction activity cannot be accurately estimated at this time. However, all of the solid waste expected from construction activity can be disposed of at the Western Regional Landfill.

It should be noted that the existing residence referenced above has since been demolished. In addition to construction waste, the project will generate operational waste. Based on the City of Rocklin's generation rate of 3.9 pounds of solid waste per day per capita (Placer County SWMP, 1989, p. 136), the project's residential land uses would be expected to generate approximately 5,658 pounds per day (558 units multiplied by the California Department of Finance's population generation estimate of 2.6 persons per dwelling unit in the City of Rocklin, multiplied by 3.9 pounds). This amount of solid waste needing landfilling should be considered a worst-case analysis due to mandatory recycling requirements contained in AB 939 and implemented through the Placer County Solid Waste Management Plan. Increasing amounts of solid wastes would be expected to occupy regional landfills, and result in the need for further solid waste disposal measures; however, as indicated previously, the Nortech Landfill could potentially undergo expansion by 450 acres on an adjacent property.

While the project would contribute solid waste to existing conditions, Kathryn Von Seeburg<sup>6</sup> of Auburn Placer Disposal Service (APDS) has indicated that collection of residential waste is generally approved due to the open access to bins. The residential portions of the project would be served by APDS for collection. The commercial portion of the project site would undergo separate environmental review upon the submission of a development application for the commercial site. At that time, a site plan with the final commercial approach and enclosure specifications would be made available for the review and approval of APDS. Solid waste collection fees are set by the City of Rocklin to fully cover the costs of waste collection and disposal. Fees are reviewed periodically to assure that they cover the costs of any additional equipment or personnel necessitated by development projects.

The residential portion of the project would add 5,658 pounds or 2.829 tons per day and the landfill is permitted to accept approximately 1,000 more tons per day. According to Mr. Carmichael, the Placer County Solid Waste Division determines that a significant impact would occur to the landfill if the proposed project increases the waste generation by three percent or more than the current waste intake. The project's generation of 2.829 tons per day is 0.25 percent of the current daily waste stream of 900 tons (900 has been as the conservative figure in this tabulation). Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impacts to solid waste disposal and recycling services.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-4 Impacts to police protection.**

Police protection services for the proposed project would be provided from the Rocklin Police Department at 4080 Rocklin Road, located south of the project site approximately three miles from the southern end of the site. Captain Dan Ruden<sup>7</sup> of the Rocklin Police Department has indicated that the Department's service ratio is 1.2 officers per 1,000 people. Using this ratio, the project would generate the need for approximately 1.74 more officers, along with the materials and vehicles needed to equip them properly. City Council has the authority to increase Police Department funding commensurate with the need to hire new sworn officers, civilian staff, and equipment. This need is addressed as part of the budget process.

The Police Department currently has a response time of just over four minutes for Priority 1 calls, which range from office alarms to burglaries and violent felonies. For calls deemed an imminent danger, the response time is generally substantially lower than four minutes. As a comparison, the Mesa, AZ Police Department has average response times of 3.7 minutes to Priority 1 calls, and the Los Angeles Police Department has an average response time of 10.5 minutes to Priority 1 calls.

According to Captain Ruden, the primary issues of concern for the proposed project include the site topography's effect on shadowing issues related to the use of officers' portable radios, which receive transmissions from a transmitter recently relocated to Crest Drive. The Department's standard for transmissions is that the portable radio should work in 98 percent of on-street situations (indoor locations not included due to uncontrollable factors). Captain Ruden has indicated that an analysis of the site's effects on radio transmissions should be done to avoid possible impacts to portable radio transmission. Therefore, while funding for police services is primarily from the general fund and is provided for the City Council based on need, the project would have *potentially significant* impacts on the ability of the Police Department to provide service to project residents.

#### Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measure(s) would reduce impacts associated with police protection to a *less-than-significant* level.

- 4.12MM-4(a) *Prior to approval of the final maps, the project applicant shall provide an analysis of the shadowing effect of project site topography on police portable radios within the project site (which the Police Department has indicated can be done by Motorola for approximately \$2,000 per site) for the review and approval of the Police Department. If the Police Department determines that radio transmissions are adequate within the project site, no further mitigation is required. If the Police Department determines that the current location of the transmitter provides inadequate transmission capabilities for*

*the Department's portable radios, the applicant shall fund either a) moving the transmitter to a site that would provide adequate transmission to the Rocklin Police Department service area, or b) the construction of a new transmitter to serve the Clover Valley site, including the transmitter and all necessary parts for its construction.*

#### **4.12I-5 Impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services.**

Advanced life support (ALS) systems are provided by American Medical Response, which would be expected, as a private company, to provide additional services as demand increases. Basic life support (BLS) systems are provided by the Rocklin Fire Department.

At full buildout, the proposed project would add 558 dwelling units and approximately 1,451 new residents within the City of Rocklin. The project would be ultimately be served by a fire station on the project site, within the central west portion of the site. This location would enable quick response times to project residents, as well as add necessary protections and faster response times to residents in this area of the City. However, the fire station site would not be developed with the rest of the project, but would be dedicated to the City by the developer for future construction.

The Fire Department currently provides a five-minute average response time to 90 percent of the City. According to City of Rocklin Battalion Chief Bart Petittlerc<sup>8</sup>, the project site topography, fuel load and resultant fire severity are the problems anticipated with fire service to the project site.

The City of Rocklin requires new developments to pay impact mitigation fees (a portion goes to the Fire Department) per dwelling unit. In addition, the project would be required to annex into the City-wide Community Facility District (CFD) No. 1 and pay yearly City-wide Fire Department impact fees which are adjusted as needed.

At a Department standard of 1.0 firefighters per 1,000 population, the proposed project would generate a demand for approximately 1.45 additional firefighters (City of Rocklin Public Facilities Master Plan, 1988, p. 73). Because the project would increase demand for fire services, and could result in fire hazards, the project would result in a ***potentially significant*** impact to fire services.

#### Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10MM-6(a) through (c) in Chapter 4.10, Hazards, of this Draft EIR would reduce the magnitude of impacts related to wildland fires. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

4.12MM-5(a) *The Design Guidelines shall address control of vegetation to reduce fire hazard which shall include the preparation of a Fuel Management Plan which shall address but not be limited to the following:*

- *Disposal of removed brush and trees within only fuel break area;*
- *Appropriate clearance around homes; and*
- *Access points as necessary including open space areas.*

4.12MM-5(b) *The timing of fire station construction shall be determined by the Rocklin City Council and shall be adequate to maintain desired service levels/response time to the project site.*

4.12MM-5(c) *Development of the site shall be carried out in accordance with City of Rocklin Fire Department rules and regulations and the Uniform Building Code regulations adopted by the City of Rocklin.*

4.12MM-5(d) *Prior to approval of the final maps, the project applicant shall provide proof to the Community Development Department that fire flow requirements shall be met.*

4.12MM-5(e) *The project shall conform to all State Responsibility Area requirements.*

4.12MM-5(f) *Prior to approval of design review for residential structures, the applicant shall show that all roofs shall be Class A type.*

4.12MM-5(g) *The City shall enter into an agreement with CDF to continue to protect the undeveloped portions of the property and the developer shall be required to pay the standby cost.*

4.12MM-5(h) *In conjunction with submittal of the improvement plans, the project applicant shall pay the Fire District's adopted impact mitigation fees.*

#### **4.12I-6 Increased demand for library services and facilities.**

Library services in Rocklin are provided by the Auburn-Placer County Library District, which was formed in 1967 with the consolidation of Auburn Public Library and the Placer County Library. This system of libraries serves all of Placer County with the exception of the Cities of Roseville and Lincoln, which own and operate their own municipal library systems.

The current service goal as identified by the Board of Supervisors in the Facilities Master Plan and Public Services Master Plan is 0.4 square feet per person in a given service area, as well as one computer per 1,000 population. Per Mark Parker, the Director of Library Services for the Auburn-Placer County Library District, current library area provided in the vicinity of the project site includes approximately 500 square feet in Penryn, 3,712 square feet in Loomis (which will be expanded to 4,500 square feet before June 2006), and 7,800 square feet in Rocklin.

Mr. Parker has indicated that residents from the proposed project would probably use either the Rocklin or Loomis branches; the Rocklin branch has better resources and longer hours, but the Loomis branch is closer. Loomis's General Plan anticipates a population of 11,400 by 2010; by this estimate, the Loomis branch is currently not adequate per the Master Plan standards. With the expansion by June 2006, the branch is anticipated to be adequate, with 4,500 square feet. (It should be noted, however, that the California Department of Finance estimates the January 1, 2005 population of Loomis as 6,274, making the current library square footage more than adequate).

According to the California Department of Finance, as of January 1, 2005, the population of the City of Rocklin was estimated to be 50,494. Thus, the City of Rocklin would need 20,198 square feet of library space. Thus, a deficit of 12,398 square feet of library area currently exists in Rocklin as the Rocklin branch has only 7,800 square feet.

The project alone would add 1,451 new residents to the population of Rocklin, which would result in the need for 580.4 square feet of library service area. However, Placer County has a public facilities fee that is applied to new development. This fee is collected by the City of Rocklin at the time of building permit issuance and is transferred back to Placer County. Monies collected under this fee in Rocklin are used expressly for public facilities in Rocklin. The applicant would pay the public facilities fee at the time of building permit issuance; therefore, the project would have *less-than-significant* impacts caused by the need to expand library services and facilities.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-7 Increased demand for school services and facilities.**

The project would result in the addition of students to the Rocklin, Loomis, and Placer Unified School Districts. Susan Wesselius, Director of Facilities and Construction for the Rocklin Unified School District, has indicated that the Rocklin USD does not guarantee specific schools because of class-size issues. In order to qualify for funding from the State Program for Class Size Reduction and to follow District practice of balancing class sizes, students



from new development may be required to attend a school other than the one in their area.

Cathy Allen, Director of Facilities and Operations with the Placer County Office of Education, which oversees the Loomis and Placer Unified School Districts, has indicated that these districts will be over capacity with the addition of the Clover Valley project (see Table 4.12-4). Although Rocklin Unified School District is currently operating below capacity and would not be impacted by the proposed project, Loomis Unified and Placer Joint Unified School District are currently over capacity and would be further impacted by development of the project.

However, the project applicant would be required per SB 50 and AB 16 to pay a school impact fees. Levels of developer fee contribution are determined by the State Allocation Board and increase annually. Current State statutes dictate that school districts have the authority to levy fees (known as statutory or Level I fees) on new development at rates of \$2.14 per square foot of new residential and \$0.34 per square foot for commercial and industrial development. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less-than-significant* impacts to school services in the project area.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-8 Increased demand for park and recreation services and facilities.**

New developments are required to either dedicate parkland or pay park development fees based on a General Plan standard of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

The project would add approximately 1,451 people to the population of the City of Rocklin (558 units multiplied by the California Department of Finance's population generation estimate of 2.6 people per dwelling unit in the City of Rocklin). Based on the City's General Plan standard of five acres of park per 1,000 residents, the project would be required to contribute 7.255 acres of park and recreational services to the City. The project includes 5.3 acres of park facilities, thereby not satisfying the City's General Plan park policy.

However, the City's subdivision ordinance provides for the collection of park and recreation fees and/or parkland dedication for new residential developments at the time properties are subdivided. The fees are used to fund the acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities commensurate with the established parkland standard. Fees are also collected through an annual tax on each dwelling unit to fund park maintenance. The proposed project would impact recreation by contributing to the need for additional recreational facilities in the City of Rocklin. However, the

applicant would pay park and recreation fees as required by the City's subdivision ordinance, and therefore the project would have *less-than-significant* impacts caused by the need to expand recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**4.12I-9 Increased demand for gas, electric, and telephone service.**

The construction of the proposed project would require the project applicant to extend gas, electric, and telephone lines to serve the project site. The applicant would work with the appropriate service providers to do so. Because the project is adjacent to existing residential development to the east, gas, electric, and telephone lines that serve the subdivision could easily be connected to the proposed project. Additionally, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) is obligated by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rule 15 to extend services to all new developments. Provision of telephone service is generally addressed by the providers in accordance with service demand in accordance with State Public Utilities Commission rules. Therefore, impacts to gas, electric, and telephone service would be *less-than-significant*.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**4.12I-10 Long-term impacts to public services and utilities from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Rocklin area.**

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute toward an increased demand for public services and utilities within the City of Rocklin. As discussed in this section, the project-level contribution to the City's public service and utility needs would also be less-than-significant after mitigation with regard to wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, parks, schools, electric power, natural gas, and communications systems. Therefore, the project would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative impacts.

Mitigation Measure(s)

*None required.*

**Endnotes**

---

<sup>1</sup> Placer County Water Agency. *SB 610 and SB 221 Analysis for Clover Valley Subdivision*, December 16, 2005..

<sup>2</sup> *City of Rocklin General Plan*, April 1991

<sup>3</sup> Parker, Mark, Director of Library Services, Auburn-Placer County Library District. Telephone conversation with Jessica Hankins, December 7, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Martin, Brian. Telephone conversation with Jessica Hankins. January 13, 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Carmichael, Tom, Environmental Resource Specialist, Placer County Solid Waste Division. Telephone conversations with Jessica Hankins, December 8 and 9, 2005.

<sup>6</sup> Von Seeburg, Kathryn, Auburn Placer Disposal Service. Telephone conversation with Jessica Hankins, December 8, 2005.

<sup>7</sup> Dan Ruden, Captain, Rocklin Police Department. Phone conversation with Jessica Hankins on December 7, 2005.

<sup>8</sup> Petitioner, Bart, Battalion Chief. Rocklin Fire Department. Phone conversations with Jessica Hankins on December 8 and 9, 2005.