
1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF EIR



1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF EIR

INTRODUCTION

The Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Maps Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) as amended. The City of Rocklin is the lead agency for the environmental review of the Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Maps ("proposed project") evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers and the general public of the environmental effects of the proposed project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project that may further reduce the significant effects. The public agency shall consider the information in this EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency prior to making a decision on the approval of the project.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The current project follows a 1995 annexation of the subject property and a 2002 proposed large lot tentative subdivision map. A 1995 Annexation EIR was certified by the Rocklin City Council for the Annexation project, and a 2002 EIR was released for public review for a Large Lot Tentative Map project. The Large Lot Tentative Map project was revised prior to certification hearings. The project now includes both a Large Lot Tentative Map and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps.

1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR

In 1991, the property owner requested the necessary land-use entitlements for a project plan that consisted of 974 residential units on 545± acres. The plan also included 4.5± acres of Retail Commercial, 10± acres of Park area, 58± acres for Recreation/Conservation, and 24± acres for streets. The land-use entitlements requested at that time were to:

- Annex the site to the City of Rocklin (AN-91-02);
- Amend the 1991 City of Rocklin General Plan land-use designations and Circulation Element (GPA-91-07);
- Change the existing Zone Designation (Z-96-03);
- Adopt a General Development Plan (PDG-91-06); and
- Approve Design Guidelines (DR-96-04).

The City of Rocklin's Environmental Coordinator determined that a comprehensive EIR would be necessary for approval of the annexation and development entitlements. In

January 1993, a Notice of Preparation of an EIR was prepared for the Clover Valley Annexation and Development Plan and released for a 30-day public review period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was conducted by the City staff. A Program EIR (SCH#93122077) was prepared and circulated for a 45-day public review period in September 1995. The Rocklin City Council conducted public hearings on the EIR and land use entitlements in January 1997, certified the EIR, and approved the proposed entitlements in February 1997. The City Council then approved a Development Agreement (DA-97-01) for the Clover Valley project in December 1997. Subsequent to the Rocklin City Council action, the Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission approved the annexation of the subject site into the City of Rocklin relying on the 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR.

2002 Clover Valley Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Draft EIR

In October 2000, the applicant submitted a Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (LLTSM) to the City of Rocklin Planning Department to subdivide the entire 622.3± undeveloped acres of Clover Valley into 47 large lots (SD-98-05). The proposed lots ranged from 2.9 acres to 47.6 acres, with 32.1 acres proposed for major streets. The proposed project also included the construction of an off-site sewer extension to ensure that the project area would be provided with adequate wastewater conveyance capacity.

The City of Rocklin Planning Department distributed a Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the LLTSM for a 30-day public review period on April 25, 2001. It was determined that additional review time would be provided for the NOP, and comments were accepted through June 18, 2001. The LLTSM Draft EIR was completed and circulated for a 45-day public review period on August 26, 2002. The City of Rocklin determined that additional review time was necessary for the Draft EIR and the comment period was extended to 60 days. In addition, a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held on October 9, 2002.

Prior to the certification of the Final EIR, the applicant amended the project application to include the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (SLTSM). Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that a lead agency must recirculate an EIR if project or environmental changes occur:

A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental changes setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect [. . .].

Based on the substantially revised project description and comments received on the 2002 EIR, the City chose to recirculate the entire EIR.

Regarding submittal of new comments, Section 15088.5(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates the following:

When an EIR is substantially revised and the entire document is recirculated, the lead agency may require reviewers to submit new comments and, in such cases, need not respond to those comments received during the earlier circulation period. The lead agency shall advise reviewers, either in the text of the revised EIR or by an attachment to the revised EIR, that although part of the administrative record, the previous comments do not require a written response in the final EIR, and that new comments must be submitted for the revised EIR. The lead agency need only respond to those comment submitted in response to the recirculated revised EIR.

The EIR is being substantially revised; therefore, per Section 15088.5(f)(1), the City of Rocklin has determined that any comments submitted previously must be resubmitted. Although the previous comments received will be taken into consideration during the preparation of the current EIR and are part of the administrative record, only those resubmitted for the current will be responded to in the Final EIR.

Section 15088.5(f)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the "lead agency shall send a notice of recirculation to every agency, person or organization that commented on the prior EIR. The notice shall indicate, at a minimum, whether new comments may be submitted only on the recirculated portions of the EIR or on the entire EIR in order to be considered by the agency." The City of Rocklin has distributed notices of recirculation with the appropriate information to all the agencies, individuals, and organizations who commented on the prior EIR.

2005 Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps 2006 Draft EIR

The applicant submitted a revised application for the Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps (LSLTSM) to the City of Rocklin in June of 2005. This current project application requests the subdivision of Clover Valley's 622.3± undeveloped acres into 33 large lots ranging from 0.7 acres to 104.4 acres with 46.4 acres of proposed major streets. The large lots would establish individual units being further subdivided by the proposed Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (SLTSM). The Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map further subdivides the large lots into a total of 558 single-family residential lots, 82 landscape lots, and related interior roadways.

The proposed project would include construction of 558 residential lots, one 5.3-acre park site, one 5.0-acre neighborhood commercial site, as well as major streets and open space areas. A total of 366 acres would remain in open space and landscape lot areas. A 1.0-acre future fire station site would be dedicated to the City by the applicant and would be constructed at a later date by the City.

If approved by the Rocklin City Council, the proposed project would also include the construction of on-site streets, bicycle trails, water lines, sewer lines, creek crossings, and utilities, including phone, electrical, and natural gas lines. The proposed project would also include the construction of an off-site sanitary sewer extension to ensure that the

project is provided with adequate wastewater conveyance capacity. The site is estimated to have 28,246 trees. The estimated number of trees to be removed for the construction of the proposed project is 7,422. Of these, 1,632 trees to be removed are associated with the construction of the major roadway infrastructure.

Sierra College Boulevard (a major north/south arterial roadway), which would provide primary access to the project site, is located east of the project site. A new roadway, Valley View Parkway, is proposed to traverse the site for approximately 4,700 feet from Sierra College Boulevard to Park Drive. Three traffic signals are proposed along Valley View Parkway, one at each end of the street where the street terminates at the existing Park Drive and Sierra College Boulevard, and a signal at the Nature Trail Way-Forest Clover Road and Valley View Parkway intersection.

The proposed project would result in the removal of grasslands, shrubs, and trees. The construction activities anticipated to occur as part of the large lot improvements and small lot development would result in the surface grading of approximately 309.6 acres. Construction of only the major roads would result in the surface grading of approximately 46.4 acres.

It should be noted that, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (f)(1), because the Clover Valley Recirculated Draft EIR has been substantially revised and the entire document will be recirculated, the City of Rocklin has decided to require reviewers to submit new comments. The previous comments submitted during the earlier circulation period of the 2002 EIR will not receive written responses in the Final EIR for this document.

The current Draft EIR relies on the 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR only for relevant information, but does not rely on the 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR for conclusions of significance of environmental impacts.

PURPOSE OF THE RECIRCULATED EIR

As provided in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency also has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues.

The Recirculated EIR is an informational document that informs decision makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental effects of a proposed project. An EIR must identify possible means to minimize the significant effects and describe a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project. The lead agency, for this project the City of Rocklin, is required to "recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification."

EIR PROCESS

This Recirculated Draft EIR represents one component of the EIR process. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the City of Rocklin for the proposed project and circulated for a 30-day public review period from September 12, 2005 to October 14, 2005 (see Appendix A). A scoping meeting was held on October 5, 2005 to obtain comments from the public on the scope of the EIR. Comments received by the City from the public and public agencies in response to the re-issued Notice of Preparation are included in Appendices B and C and summarized later in this chapter.

A public hearing will be held during the Draft EIR public review period on February 23, 2006 to receive comments and concerns on the Draft EIR. Following the Draft EIR 45-day public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that includes responses to written comments on the current Draft EIR, any necessary revisions to the Draft EIR, and a Mitigation Monitoring Program which includes all mitigation measures in the Draft and Final EIRs.

LEAD AGENCY

The City of Rocklin is the lead agency under CEQA for the preparation of this Recirculated EIR. CEQA (§ 21067) defines the lead agency as “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment.”

SCOPE OF THE RECIRCULATED EIR

Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, the scope of this EIR includes specific issues and concerns identified as potentially significant. Furthermore, CEQA Section 15120 determines that:

the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or where no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced.

The City of Rocklin has determined that the preparation of an EIR is appropriate because potentially significant environmental impacts could be caused by implementing the proposed project. These impacts include, but are not limited to, the addition of traffic to the project area, grading of the hillsides, removal of existing oak trees, displacement of certain biological species and loss of habitat, damage or loss of cultural resources, negative effect on air quality, and strain on public services. The 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR is a program-level EIR, and the current EIR is a project-level EIR for large and small lot tentative maps. As noted previously, the current Draft EIR relies on the 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR only for relevant information, but does not rely on the 1995 Clover Valley Annexation EIR for conclusions of significance of environmental impacts.

This EIR evaluates the existing environmental resources in the vicinity of the project site, analyzes potential impacts on those resources due to the proposed project, and identifies mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce the magnitude of those impacts.

CEQA issue areas identified for study in this Draft EIR include:

- Land Use;
- Aesthetics;
- Transportation and Circulation;
- Air Quality;
- Noise;
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources;
- Biological Resources;
- Geology;
- Hazards;
- Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage; and
- Public Services and Utilities.

Agricultural resources were not determined to need evaluation in this EIR because the project site is not designated for agricultural uses, identified as prime farm or agricultural lands, used for agricultural production, nor under a Williamson Act contract.

Policy 2.1 of the Rocklin Housing Element (2002-2007) is to “provide high quality housing for current and future residents with a diverse range of income levels.” The project would not provide for very low, low, or moderate income households. However, the City Housing Element designates land for affordable housing, and the Clover Valley project was not included within the affordable housing target areas; therefore, affordable housing will not be discussed further in this chapter. The project would not displace any existing substantial numbers of people or housing, and therefore this issue will not be discussed further in this Draft EIR.

Growth-inducing impacts of the project are discussed in Chapter 5.0, Statutorily Required Sections. Mineral resources are discussed in the Geology chapter (Chapter 4.10).

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The City of Rocklin received 99 comment letters on the re-issued NOP for the Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps Recirculated EIR. In addition, 31 verbal comments were submitted during the NOP scoping meeting and recorded and subsequently transcribed by Capitol Reporters. A copy of each letter and the scoping meeting transcript are provided in Appendices B and C of this EIR. These appendices do not include comment letters from the original NOP.

The letters were authored by representatives of state and local agencies, businesses, non-profit organizations, and individuals:

State and Local Agencies

1. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region – Dannas J. Berchtold, Storm Water Unit (two letters dated September 22 and 27, 2005)
2. City of Roseville Community Development – Mark Morse, Environmental Coordinator
3. City of Roseville Planning Department – Kathy Pease, Senior Planner
4. Placer County Community Development / Resource Agency – Rebecca Maddex, Associate Civil Engineer, P.E., Engineering and Surveying Division
5. Placer County Department of Public Works – Rebecca Bond, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
6. Placer County Department of Public Works – Richard Moorehead, P.E., Associate Engineer
7. Placer County Environmental Health Division – Dana Wiyninger, Land Use Technical Specialist
8. Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District – Andrew Darrow, P.E., Development Coordinator
9. Placer County Office of Education – Cathy Allen, Director, Facility & Operations
10. Placer County Water Agency – Heather Trejo, Environmental Specialist
11. Placer Mosquito Abatement District – Jamesina J. Scott, Ph.D., Vector Ecologist
12. South Placer Municipal Utility District – Richard R. Stein, Project Administrator
13. State of California Department of California Highway Patrol – Richard Ward, Captain, Commander, Auburn Area
14. State of California Department of Fish and Game – Sandra Morey, Regional Manager
15. State of California Department of Transportation – Katherine Eastham, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning – Southwest and East
16. State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit – Scott Morgan, Associate Planner
17. State of California Public Utilities Commission – Kevin Boles, Utilities Engineer, Rail Crossings Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division
18. State of California, Native American Heritage Commission – Debbie Pilas-Treadway, Environmental Specialist III
19. Town of Loomis - Donald B. Mooney, Attorney for the Town of Loomis

Organizations and Businesses

20. California Oak Foundation - Janet Santos Cobb, President
21. Dry Creek Conservancy – Gregg Bates, Executive Director
22. Granite Bay Flycasters – R. Heath Wakelee, VP Conservation

23. Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association – Sharon D. Roseme
24. Save Clover Valley – Allison Miller, Chair
25. Sierra Club Placer Group – Marilyn Jasper, Chair; Clover Valley Foundation – Cathie French Tritel, Director; Sierra Foothills Audubon Society – Ed Pandolfino, Ph.D.
26. Springfield Whitney Oaks Homeowners Association – Kim Moran
27. Union Pacific Railroad – Wayne K. Horiuchi, Special Representative

Individuals

28. Suzanne, Resident
29. Tiffany Adams, Resident
30. Marjorie Anderson, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
31. Phyllis Anzelmo, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
32. John Armstrong, Resident (written and scoping meeting comments, including two letters)
33. Louis and Dorothy Arredondo, Residents
34. Stephanie Austin, Resident
35. Louise Bachtold, Resident
36. Thomas S. Ball, Student
37. Aria Barker, Resident
38. Arietta Balestreri, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
39. Toni Behl, Resident
40. Jo Bentz, Resident (two letters dated October 10 and 17, 2005)
41. Douglas L. Brewer and David R. Bennett, Residents
42. Mary Bischel, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
43. Jean Broome, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
44. Patricia Calabrese, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
45. Carole Cannon, Resident
46. Jim Cannon, Resident
47. Diane Carpenter-Madoshi, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
48. Ethel and Phil Casebolt, Residents
49. Holly Clark, Resident
50. Lauren Clinton, Resident
51. Carol Crawford, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
52. Roger Crawford, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
53. Anne and Daniel Diroll, Resident
54. Janet Dunlap, Resident
55. David and Kristi Ehrhardt, Resident
56. Chester Eslinger, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
57. Elaine Eslinger, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
58. Delores Freeby, Resident
59. Diane Gallagher, Resident
60. Frank N. Gallagher, Resident
61. Edward A. Gantt, Resident
62. Candace Garcia, Resident

63. Kelly Gawel, Resident
64. Melanie Hass, Resident
65. Janet M. Hale, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
66. Janet M. Hale, Arlene, M. Hoxie, James D. Hoxie, Barbara Heath, et al., Residents
67. Linda Hall, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
68. Douglas and Marene Hammitt, Residents
69. Gordon R. Havens, Resident
70. Mr. and Mrs. James Herrera, Residents
71. Lindsey Ho Young, Resident
72. Charlotte J. Howell, Resident
73. Johann and Gertraud Huber, Residents
74. William and Sharon Ireton, Residents
75. Marina Jaramillo, Resident
76. Marilyn Jasper, Resident
77. Scott Johnson, Resident
78. Darrell Jome and Betty Mette-Jome, Residents
79. Florence Kendall, Resident
80. Suzanne Kizer, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
81. Mary Jane Lawler, Resident
82. David Leary, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
83. Lisa and Stephen Loeb, Resident
84. Liese Loon-Stern, Resident
85. Tom McMahan, Resident
86. Joe Medeiros, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
87. Allison Miller, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
88. Jennifer Molinn-Stidger, Resident
89. Virginia Moran, Resident
90. Sarah Nix, Resident
91. John and Marlene Norton, Residents
92. James Nunley, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
93. Denise Nunley, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
94. O'Deegan Family, Residents
95. Neal F. O'Donnell, Resident
96. Ida S. Pace, Resident (scoping meeting and written comments)
97. C.A. Parker Family, Residents
98. Hanny and George Perbetsky, Residents
99. Don Perera, Resident and Member of Save Clover Valley Foundation
100. Daniel M. Perry and Carole D. Perry, Residents
101. Ana Plevanck, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
102. Vladimir Plevanck, Resident (scoping meeting and written comments)
103. Eugene Polgar, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
104. Joanne Price, Realtor and Resident
105. Margo Rabine, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
106. Tina Runyen, Resident
107. John Schimandle, Resident

108. Phil C. Sienkiewicz, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
109. Norma Snyder, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
110. Susan Somers, Resident
111. Brenda Sowders, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
112. Larry Sowders, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
113. Kevin Tilley, Resident (scoping meeting comments)
114. Jeanne Tomasello, Resident
115. Leon and Roberta Tuttle, Resident
116. Michi Vallieres, Resident
117. John R. and Janet Voris, Residents
118. Ken Votaw, Resident
119. Kenneth and Norma Vuletich, Residents
120. Charlene Walters, Resident
121. Sarah Ward, Resident
122. Whelan and Grover Families, Residents
123. Chad M. Williams, Student
124. Duane D. Wilson, Resident
125. Elizabeth Woll, Resident
126. Gilbert Woody, Resident (scoping meeting comments)

In addition, the following letter was received after the close of the NOP comment period:

127. Whitney Oaks Community Association – Garth Tanner, President

The following list summarizes the concerns identified in these letters, categorizing them by issue:

Land Use:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibilities with the project site's surrounding communities; • Loss of open space.
Aesthetics:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting the existing project site into residential property; • Maintaining the rural character and lighting of the valley.
Transportation and Circulation:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public safety; • Studying various traffic models; • Access to Rawhide Road and other existing roadways; • Impacts on Sierra College Blvd from the project entrance to the Town of Loomis (including roadway segment and Delmar Ave/Sierra College Blvd.); • Cumulative traffic and impacts to county roadways from construction traffic;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions related to pedestrian traffic, and increased traffic volumes on Sierra College Boulevard and Park Drive; • Impacts to I-80 and Hwy-65.
Air Quality:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic emissions and pollution; • Long-term operational emissions; • Air quality health effects; • Regional air quality, as well as site-specific data; • Cumulative air quality impacts related to diesel emissions and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and NOx).
Noise	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise levels created by traffic and project construction; • Increased noise levels from commercial and retail businesses in Clover Valley; • Noise and disruptions during construction; • The need for the development of sound walls to lesson impacts to increased noise levels.
Cultural and Paleontological Resources:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project site's qualification for the National Register of Prehistoric and Historic Places; • The potential for disturbance of known historic and archaeological resources within the project vicinity; • Potential occurrence of unknown cultural resources on-site.
Biological Resources:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands delineation; • The removal of oak trees and long-term survivability of remaining oak trees and woodlands; • Designation of foothill streams as fish habitats; • Designation of foothills and streams as habitats for steelhead, salmon, Western Spadefoot Toad, Northwestern pond turtles state- and/or federal-listed species; • Evaluation of the proposed project contribution to habitat fragmentation and population isolation of plant and animal species; • Pollution of Clover Valley Creek.
Geology:	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sedimentation and silt build-up; • The potential for landslides and erosion; • The grading/amount of "cut and fill."

<p>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildland fires; • Construction related hazardous.
<p>Hydrology and Water Quality:</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality, drainage, erosion, and flood impacts; • Pesticides impacting water supply; • The recommended review of local detention needs; • The quality of the creek, sedimentation, flooding, and runoff; • Groundwater contamination from Clover Valley development; • Size, operation and maintenance of detention ponds; • The City's Phase II Stormwater permit(s) and required ordinances.
<p>Public Services and Utilities</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply and water treatment; • School facilities (related to population and funding sources); • Consider minor boundary adjustments in order to insure neighborhoods are maintained within a single district; • Increased crime rate; • Use of CHP officers to improve the Highway transportation system during the construction phase. Location and placement of the proposed off site sewer line, including the proposed sewer line paths; • Sewer collection capacity.
<p>Alternatives</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential alternatives which could result in fewer biological impacts; • Develop alternatives that reduces overall project extent by eliminating development proposed immediately adjacent to Clover Valley Creek.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This Recirculated Draft EIR is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Scope of EIR

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Acknowledges alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including its location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Assessment

Contains a project-specific analysis of environmental issue areas. The subsection for each environmental issue contains an introduction and description of the setting of the project site, identifies project-specific impacts, and recommends appropriate mitigation measures.

Chapter 5 – Statutorily Required Sections

Provides discussions required by CEQA regarding impacts that would result from the proposed project, including a summary of cumulative impacts, potential growth-inducing impacts, and significant irreversible changes to the environment.

Chapter 6 – Alternatives Analysis

Describes the alternatives to the proposed project and their respective environmental effects.

Chapter 7 – EIR Authors / Persons Consulted

Lists report authors and persons who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the EIR.

Chapter 8 – References

Provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Appendices

Includes the NOP, responses to the NOP, and additional technical information.