

CHAPTER 6

Changes and Edits to the Draft and Recirculated Draft EIR

Introduction

This chapter provides all revisions to all chapters of the Draft and Recirculated Draft EIR. Text in standard print is original EIR text; text that is underlined is added text; and text that is struck out is deleted. Modifications are organized by EIR chapters, and page numbers refer to locations in the Draft and Recirculated Draft EIR unless otherwise noted.

Draft EIR

Executive Summary

On page ES-5, make the following changes:

- **North** along Wise Road west of Dowd Road, Coon Creek and Doty Ravine between Dowd Road and Gladding Road, and Wise Road between Gladding and McCourtney Roads;
- **East** generally along McCourtney Road, Hungry Hollow Road and Sierra College Boulevard;
- **South** along the City of Rocklin (Whitney Ranch) east of SR 65 and Athens Avenue west of SR 65; and
- **West** approximately two miles west of Dowd Road.

On page ES-6, make the following changes to the 3rd paragraph and Table ES-1:

Table ES-1 provides a list of the designated land uses proposed for the draft Land Use Diagram along with an estimate of acreage attributed to each land use category. The table also identifies the proposed increase in acreage over the City's existing General Plan. Low density residential accounts for the primary residential use (~~7,149~~ 7,610 acres). Commercial land uses (including Neighborhood Commercial) account for ~~2,301~~ 2,300 acres and Industrial land uses (including Industrial Planned Development) account for ~~5,194~~ 2,900 acres. The draft Land Use Diagram would also include an estimated ~~10,086~~ 13,130 acres of ~~open~~

~~space/agricultural~~ Agriculture/Open Space land. An additional ~~4,532~~ 1,530 acres parks and public designated land will be located in the City’s planning area.

**TABLE ES-1
COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE CURRENT GENERAL PLAN**

Land Use Designations	Proposed Project	Current General Plan	Proposed Increase
Residential			
Rural Residential	4,032 <u>1,190</u> acres	0 acres	4,032 <u>1,190</u> acres
Country Estates	4,174 <u>1,350</u> acres	0 acres	4,174 <u>1,350</u> acres
Low-Density Residential	7,149 <u>7,610</u> acres	4,076 <u>4,080</u> acres	3,073 <u>3,530</u> acres
Medium-Density Residential	4,559 <u>1,740</u> acres	374 <u>370</u> acres	4,185 <u>1,370</u> acres
High-Density Residential	676 <u>750</u> acres	453 <u>150</u> acres	523 <u>600</u> acres
Commercial/Industrial			
Neighborhood Commercial	482 <u>180</u> acres	28 <u>30</u> acres	454 <u>150</u> acres
Commercial	2,419 <u>2,120</u> acres	284 <u>280</u> acres	1,835 <u>1,840</u> acres
Business Park	510 acres	82 <u>80</u> acres	429 <u>430</u> acres
Industrial	4,236 <u>1,240</u> acres	643 <u>610</u> acres	623 <u>630</u> acres
Industrial Planned Development	4,657 <u>1,660</u> acres	983 <u>980</u> acres	674 <u>680</u> acres
Agriculture/Open Space			
Agriculture	429 <u>430</u> acres	4,909 <u>4,910</u> acres	(4,480 acres)
Open Space	9,657 <u>12,700</u> acres	3,077 <u>3,080</u> acres	6,580 <u>9,620</u> acres
Public/Other			
Park	694 <u>690</u> acres	267 <u>270</u> acres	427 <u>420</u> acres
Public	838 <u>840</u> acres	505 <u>500</u> acres	333 <u>340</u> acres
Future Expansion Area (or) Urban Reserve	0 acres	905 <u>910</u> acres	(905 <u>910</u> acres)
Total Area	28,942 <u>33,010</u> acres	16,256 <u>16,250</u> acres	
Total Population	132,000	66,500	

On page ES-62, make the following revisions to Table ES-3:

New Policy HS-5.13 **HS-5.13 Hazardous Materials Studies.** The City shall ensure that the proponents of development projects (including new, redevelopment, remodel, or demolition projects) address existing hazardous materials concerns through the preparation of Phase I or Phase II hazardous materials studies for each identified site as part of the design phase for each project. Particular attention should be paid to land that contained past agricultural uses. Recommendations outlined in the studies will be implemented as part of the construction phase for each project. *[New Policy – Revised Final EIR]*

Chapter 1.0 Reader's Guide

On page 1-6, Table 1-1, regarding the December 15, 2005 NOP comment letter from the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, make the following change:

December 15, 2005	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	<p>EIR must remain consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUC).</p> <p>- <u>An ALUC consistency determination with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is required for the 2050 General Plan Update. This consistency determination is required before the City Council takes action on the proposed project.</u></p>
-------------------	--	---

On page 1-15, make the following revision to the bullet point at the bottom of the page:

- ***Alternatives Report (September 2003).*** This report provides initial planning information to the General Plan Steering Committee. The report included constraints information specific to floodplains, airport ~~overflight~~ compatibility zones, and buffer areas for odor generating facilities. In addition, the report included applications for General Plan Amendments and three conceptual land use plans with associated population projections.

Chapter 2.0 Project Description

On page 2-10, make the following changes to the third paragraph:

The SUDs within the Planning Area have been developed to provide land uses that are consistent with the restrictions of the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Lincoln Regional Airport and will assist the City in providing for the economic development opportunities identified in the fiscal and economic analysis prepared for the General Plan. For instance, within SUD A, the fiscal and economic analysis calls for the provision of a 150-acre regional commercial site to be located within close proximity to the planned Nicolaus Road interchange (see Figure 2-3). Other locations within this Planning Area are envisioned for commercial to light industrial uses that require limited residential densities or use intensity requirements ~~numbers of persons per acre~~ in order to remain consistent with airport land use restrictions.

On page 2-17, make the following changes to the 2nd paragraph and Table 2-3:

Table 2-3 provides a list of the designated land uses proposed for the draft Land Use Diagram along with an estimate of acreage attributed to each land use category. The table also identifies the proposed increase in acreage over the City's existing General Plan. Low density residential accounts for the primary residential use (~~7,149~~ 7,610 acres). Commercial land uses account for ~~2,301~~ 2,300 acres and Industrial land uses account for ~~5,194~~ 2,900 acres. The draft Land Use Diagram would also include an estimated ~~40,086~~ 13,130 acres of open space/agricultural land. An

additional ~~1,532~~ 1,530 acres parks and public designated land will be located in the City’s planning area.

**TABLE 2-3
COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE CURRENT GENERAL PLAN**

Land Use Designations	Proposed Project	Current General Plan	Proposed Increase
Residential			
Rural Residential	4,032 <u>1,190</u> acres	0 acres	4,032 <u>1,190</u> acres
Country Estates	4,174 <u>1,350</u> acres	0 acres	4,174 <u>1,350</u> acres
Low-Density Residential	7,149 <u>7,610</u> acres	4,076 <u>4,080</u> acres	3,073 <u>3,530</u> acres
Medium-Density Residential	4,559 <u>1,740</u> acres	374 <u>370</u> acres	4,185 <u>1,370</u> acres
High-Density Residential	676 <u>750</u> acres	453 <u>150</u> acres	523 <u>600</u> acres
Commercial/Industrial			
Neighborhood Commercial	482 <u>180</u> acres	28 <u>30</u> acres	454 <u>150</u> acres
Commercial	2,419 <u>2,120</u> acres	284 <u>280</u> acres	1,835 <u>1,840</u> acres
Business Park	510 acres	82 <u>80</u> acres	429 <u>430</u> acres
Industrial	4,236 <u>1,240</u> acres	643 <u>610</u> acres	623 <u>630</u> acres
Industrial Planned Development	4,657 <u>1,660</u> acres	983 <u>980</u> acres	674 <u>680</u> acres
Agriculture/Open Space			
Agriculture	429 <u>430</u> acres	4,909 <u>4,910</u> acres	(4,480 acres)
Open Space	9,657 <u>12,700</u> acres	3,077 <u>3,080</u> acres	6,580 <u>9,620</u> acres
Public/Other			
Park	694 <u>690</u> acres	267 <u>270</u> acres	427 <u>420</u> acres
Public	838 <u>840</u> acres	505 <u>500</u> acres	333 <u>340</u> acres
Future Expansion Area (or) Urban Reserve	0 acres	905 <u>910</u> acres	(905 <u>910</u> acres)
Total Area	28,942 <u>33,010</u> acres	16,256 <u>16,250</u> acres	
Total Population	132,000	66,500	

Chapter 4.0 Land Use

On pages 4-6 through 4-9, make the following changes:

Village 1

The Proposed Project identifies the area west of Stardust Lane on both the **north** and **south** sides of SR 193 as Village 1 (see Figure 4-2). Village 1 has gently rolling terrain with a substantial tree canopy and Auburn Ravine, a major waterway crossing **east** to **west** along the northern boundary of the village area. Additional land use features in this area, **south** of SR 193 and to the **east** of Oak Tree Lane, include an existing County of Placer highway maintenance yard and California Department of Forestry fire station on a 48+/- acre site. On the **north** side of SR 193 and **east** of Oak Tree Lane there is an existing golf course and a turkey farm. The City’s existing General Plan designates this area to the existing City Limits as agriculture, urban reserve, and low density residential.

Village 2

The Proposed Project identifies the area **south** of Wise Road and east of Gladding McBean clay mine as Village 2 (see Figure 4-2). Specially, Village 2 is located at the **northeastern** corner of the Proposed Project generally within an area **north** of Auburn Ravine, west of Hungry Hollow Road, south of Wise Road, and **east** of the clay mine. Gladding and McCourtney Roads are existing **north/south** arterials that would traverse this village area. Currently this area generally consists of flat agricultural lands with some dense tree canopy along the **southern** boundary. Existing rural residential land uses in Placer County are to the **east** and **north** of Village 2. The existing General Plan designates this area to the existing City Limits as agriculture and low density residential.

Village 3

To the **west** of Gladding Road, the City's existing northern Sphere of Influence boundary follows along the **northern** edge of the Gladding McBean clay mine and continues along the **east** side of SR 65 to Wise Road. The Proposed Project would expand the existing **northern** Sphere of Influence boundary **west** from Gladding Road northward by approximately 6,000 feet to Coon Creek and Doty Ravine. The Proposed Project identifies the area **east** of SR 65 between the Gladding McBean clay mine and Coon Creek/Doty Ravine and **west** of Manzanita Gladding Road as Village 3 (see Figure 4-2). Land uses within this area generally consist of flat agricultural lands with a floodplain along the **northern** boundary of the proposed village area. The existing General Plan designates this area to the existing City Limits as agriculture and industrial.

Village 4

Village 4 is located on the **west** side of Dowd Road between Nicolaus Road and Wise Road (see Figure 4-2). This area generally consists of flat agricultural lands with two waterways that run **east to west**. One waterway is located in the **southern** portion of this proposed Village area and the second traverses through the middle of the proposed Village. At the **northeast** quadrant of this Village is a future 812+/- acres conservation easement site to mitigate for wetland impacts resulting from development of the SR 65 Bypass. The **northern** and **western** boundary of this Village would be adjacent to existing agricultural activities in Placer County.

On page 4-13, make the following revision to the second to last paragraph:

The area between Airport Road, Dowd Road, Coon Creek, and Markham Ravine to the south is proposed as Special Use District – A. (SUD-A). The location of SUD-A is shown in Figure 4-2. Although this area would include some residential land uses, the primary land uses within SUD-A would be community and regional commercial land uses consistent with the Lincoln Regional Airport ~~overflight~~ compatibility regulations regarding land use types and densities. The new SR 65 Bypass is proposed to traverse the middle of this area in a north/south direction with future interchanges planned at Wise and Nicolaus Roads.

On page 4-13, make the following changes to the last paragraph:

SUD-A is envisioned to be primarily a commercial area for activities that require large areas for facilities or operations but with use intensity requirements and limited residential densities ~~few persons per acre~~ as required by the airport land use regulations.

Chapter 5.0 Transportation

On pages 5-3, 5-37, 5-38, 5-63, 5-65, 5-86, 5-87, 5-88, regarding “Sioux Street,” make the following changes:

5-3: Lincoln Parkway is a north-south two-lane arterial that extends from SR 65 southeast through the Twelve Bridges Specific Plan area and connects to ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard in the City of Rocklin.

5-38: TC-3a. Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard to LOS B.

5-63: Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS D (V/C 0.82) to LOS D (V/C 0.90).

5-65: TC-12. Construct a second through lane on the northbound approach to improve the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and Stanford Ranch Road to LOS C.

5-86: Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS C to LOS E.

5-88: TC-19. Construct a second through lane on the northbound approach to improve the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and Stanford Ranch Road to LOS C.

On page 5-10, make the following revision to the last sentence of the last paragraph:

Roseville uses a modified version of the Circular 212 that assumes intersection capacities that are approximately ~~7~~ 5 percent higher than the Circular 212 method used by Placer County, Rocklin and Loomis.

Revisions to Transportation Tables

On page 5-11, Table 5-5, regarding superscript “a”, make the following changes:

**TABLE 5-5
EXISTING PM PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE AT STUDY
INTERSECTIONS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY**

Intersection	Stop Sign Controlled Intersections (Delay in Seconds)	Signalized Intersections (V/C Ratio)	LOS
Dowd Road and Wise Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
State Route 65 and Wise Road	1.1		A

**TABLE 5-5
EXISTING PM PEAK HOUR LEVELS OF SERVICE AT STUDY
INTERSECTIONS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY**

Intersection	Stop Sign Controlled Intersections (Delay in Seconds)	Signalized Intersections (V/C Ratio)	LOS
Gladding Road and Wise Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
McCourtney Road and Wise Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Dowd Road and Nicolaus Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Airport Road and Nicolaus Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
SR 193 and Sierra College Blvd	22.4		C
Dowd Road and Moore Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Fiddymment Road and Moore Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Nelson Road and Moore Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Fiddymment Road and Catlett Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Fiddymment Road and Athens Road	< 20 ^a		A-C ^a
Industrial Avenue and Athens Road		< 0.80	A-C
Watt Avenue and Baseline Road		0.94	E
Fiddymment Road and Baseline Road		0.87 (>1.00) ^b	D (F) ^b

Notes:

- a. Intersection is in rural area and handles low traffic volumes. The intersection was not counted and therefore no LOS calculation was made. Judged to operate satisfactory by observation.
b. Observed long queues indicate intersection operates at LOS F.

Source: DKS Associates, 2006.

On page 5-12, Table 5-6, regarding Sioux Street, make the following changes:

3 Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u> and Stanford Ranch Rd	0.06	A
---	------	---

On page 5-29, make the following revisions to the first bulleted paragraph:

- Cause, in the City of Roseville, a signalized intersection previously identified in Roseville's CIP as functioning at LOS C or better (v/c ratio of 0.81 or better) to deteriorate to LOS D or worse (v/c ratio of 0.82 or worse). At a signalized intersection previously identified in Roseville's CIP as functioning at LOS D or E conditions, an impact is considered significant if the Proposed Project causes operations to deteriorate to the ~~next lowest~~ a lower LOS level;

On page 5-37, first bullet, make the following changes:

Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and ~~Sunset Boulevard~~ West Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS A to LOS E.

On page 5-37, table 5-22, regarding Sioux Street, make the following changes:

3 Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u>	Stanford Ranch Rd	0.06	A	0.97	E
---	-------------------	------	---	-------------	----------

On page 5-47, make the following changes:

Such a widening may not promote pedestrian and bicycle circulation as wide roadways can be barriers for walking and cycling. The widening could discourage walking near ~~Baseline Road~~ Fiddymont Road by lengthening the distance for pedestrians and bicycle to cross Fiddymont Road to an unacceptable level.

On page 5-64, Table 5-31, regarding intersection 9, make the following changes:

9	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Boulevard</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	0.99	E	0.94	E	0.96	E
10	Atherton Rd <u>University Avenue</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	1.11	F	1.07	F	1.09	F

On page 5-64, Table 5-31, regarding Sioux Street, make the following changes:

3	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u>	Stanford Ranch Rd
---	---	-------------------

On page 5-64, Table 5-47, regarding intersections 9 and 10, make the following changes:

9	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Boulevard</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	0.67	B	0.79	C
10	Atherton Rd <u>University Avenue</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	0.49	A	0.67	B

On page 5-65, first bullet, make the following changes:

Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and ~~Sunset Boulevard~~ West Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS D (V/C 0.82) to LOS D (V/C 0.90).

On page 5-87, first bullet, make the following changes:

Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and ~~Sunset Boulevard~~ West Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS C to LOS D.

On page 5-87, Table 5-39, regarding intersection 9, make the following changes:

9	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Boulevard</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	0.70	B	0.71	C	0.73	C
10	Atherton Rd <u>University Avenue</u>	Whitney Blvd <u>Whitney Ranch Parkway</u>	0.92	E	0.89	D	0.92	E

On page 5-87, Table 5-39, regarding Sioux Street, make the following changes:

3	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u>	Stanford Ranch Rd	0.72	C	0.93	E	0.86	D
---	---	-------------------	------	---	-------------	---	-------------	---

On page 5-105, Table 5-47, regarding Sioux Street, make the following changes:

3	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u>	Stanford Ranch Rd	0.75	C	0.95	E
9	Sioux St <u>Wildcat Blvd</u>	Whitney Blvd	0.67	B	0.79	C

On page 5-105, second bullet, make the following changes:

Level of Service at the intersection of ~~Sioux Street~~ Wildcat Boulevard and ~~Sunset Boulevard~~ West Stanford Ranch Road would degrade from LOS C to LOS E.

On page 5-34, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-20:

**TABLE 5-20
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN
UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project	
		Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>A</u>
Wise Road	East of McCourtney Road	4,600	A	9,400	A
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Gold Hill Rd</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>A</u>
Fruitvale Road	East of McCourtney Road	900	A	600	A
Nicolaus Road	West of Brewer Road	2,600	A	11,700	B
Nicolaus Road	East of Brewer Road	2,500	A	12,200	B
Virginiatown Road	East of McCourtney Road	600 <u>1,800</u>	A	8,300 <u>9,500</u>	A
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Brewer Road</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>A</u>
Catlett Road	West of Brewer Road	900	A	1,100	A
Catlett Road	East of Brewer Road	900	A	6,000	A
<u>Catlett Road</u>	<u>West of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>900</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>A</u>
Brewer Road	South of Catlett Road	4,000 <u>100</u>	A	9,400 <u>5,100</u>	A
<u>McCourtney Road</u>	<u>South of Wise Road</u>	<u>3,200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>North of Wise Road</u>	<u>2,700</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>South of Riosa Road</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Fiddymont Road</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>5,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>27,300</u>	<u>F</u>

**TABLE 5-20
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN
UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project	
		Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service
<u>Fiddymment Road</u>	<u>North of Roseville City limit</u>	<u>4,400</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>13,272</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>13,500</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>23,100</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>North of Placer Corp Dr</u>	<u>18,300</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>25,400</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted roadway segments were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

On page 5-37, make the following additions to Table 5-22:

**TABLE 5-22
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS
IN CITY OF ROCKLIN EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS**

#	Intersection		Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions		
	North - South	East - West	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS
1	Atherton Rd	Sunset Blvd	0.29		A	0.48		A
2	West Stanford Ranch Rd	Sunset Blvd	0.12		A	0.56		A
3	Wildcat Blvd	West. Stanford Ranch Rd	0.06		A	0.97		E
4	Park Dr	Sunset Blvd	0.48		A	0.77		C
5	Sierra College Blvd	Granite Dr	0.62		B	0.82		D
6	Sierra College Blvd	WB I-80 ramps		32.2	C		29.5	C
7	Sierra College Blvd	EB I-80 ramps		20.7	C		9.5	A
11	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.68</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>0.71</u>		<u>C</u>
12	<u>Stanford Ranch Rd</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.62</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>0.80</u>		<u>C</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-40, make the following revisions to Table 5-24:

TABLE 5-24
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN
CITY OF ROSEVILLE EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

#	Intersection		Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project Conditions	
	North - South	East - West	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
1	Foothills Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	0.47	A	0.61	B
2	Fiddymnt Rd	Pleasant Grove Rd	0.60	A	0.73	C
3	Foothills Blvd	Pleasant Grove Rd	0.86	D	0.94	E
<u>7</u>	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>0.58</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>0.81</u>	<u>D</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>0.42</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>0.75</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>0.62</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>0.64</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>0.65</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>0.63</u>	<u>B</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>Foothills Blvd</u>	<u>Junction Blvd</u>	<u>1.02</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.06</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-60, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-29:

**TABLE 5-29
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project		Cumulative Plus Project Mitigated	
		Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service
Wise Road	East of Brewer Road	100	A	2,800	A	2,500	A
Wise Road	West of Road "A"	100	A	2,800	A	2,500	A
Wise Road	East of McCourtney Road	8,700	A	12,000	B	11,900	B
Wise Road	West of Gold Hill Rd	3,000	A	3,700	A	3,600	A
Fruitvale Road	East of McCourtney Road	800	A	700	A	700	A
Nicolaus Road	West of Brewer Road	6,700	A	14,400	C	12,000	B
Nicolaus Road	East of Brewer Road	7,100	A	15,200	D	12,600	B
Virginiatown Road	East of McCourtney Road	8,300 9,500	A	7,800 9,000	A	8,900	A
Moore Road	West of Brewer Road	200	A	1,600	A	400	A
Moore Road	East of Brewer Road	300	A	1,700	A	500	A
Moore Road	West of Road "A"	300	A	1,700	A	500	A
Catlett Road	West of Brewer Road	4,100	A	1,700	A	3,900	A
Catlett Road	East of Brewer Road	4,200	A	4,300	A	4,500	A
Catlett Road	West of Athens Avenue	4,200	A	4,300	A	4,500	A
Brewer Road	South of Catlett Road	11,600 100	B A	17,600 2,800	E A	500	A
McCourtney Road	South of Wise Road	4,700	A	5,400	A	5,300	A
Dowd Road	North of Wise Road	300	A	1,400	A	1,300	A
Dowd Road	South of Riosa Road	100	A	1,000	A	1,000	A
Fiddymont Road	South of Athens Avenue	26,900	C	61,600	F	54,000	E
Fiddymont Road	North of Roseville City limit	48,600	D	52,300	E	47,400	D

**TABLE 5-29
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project		Cumulative Plus Project Mitigated	
		Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic	Level of Service
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>28,200</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>35,100</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>32,400</u>	<u>D</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>North of Placer Corp Dr</u>	<u>39,900</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>43,800</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>39,900</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted roadway segments were not included in DEIR
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

On page 5-64, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-31:

**TABLE 5-31
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROCKLIN
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITH MITIGATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

#	Intersection		Cumulative No Project Conditions			Cumulative Plus Project Conditions			Cumulative Plus Project Conditions With Mitigated Transportation Network		
	North – South	East - West	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS
1	Atherton Road West Stanford Ranch Rd	Sunset Blvd	0.82		D	0.79		C	0.77		C
2	Wildcat Blvd	West Stanford Ranch Rd	0.82		D	0.90		D	0.90		D
3	Park Dr	Sunset Blvd	0.83		D	0.87		D	0.85		D
4	Sierra College Blvd	Granite Dr	0.87		D	0.91		E	0.90		D
5	Sierra College Blvd	WB I-80 ramps		19.9	B		19.2	B		19.4	B
6	Sierra College Blvd	EB I-80 ramps		12.4	B		10.8	B		10.8	B
7	Sierra College Blvd	Valley View Pkwy	1.00		E	0.96		E	0.94		E
8	Wildcat Blvd	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	0.99		E	0.94		E	0.96		E
9	University Ave	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	1.11		F	1.07		F	1.09		F
<u>11</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.98</u>		<u>E</u>	<u>0.99</u>		<u>E</u>	<u>0.99</u>		<u>E</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>Stanford Ranch</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.70</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>0.76</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>0.75</u>		<u>C</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR
Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-66, make the following revisions to Table 5-33:

**TABLE 5-33
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITH MITIGATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

#	Intersection		Cumulative No Project Conditions		Cumulative Plus Project Conditions		Cumulative Plus Project With Mitigated Transportation Network	
	North – South	East - West	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
1	Foothills Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.14	F	1.13	F	1.12	F
2	Fiddymment Rd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.26	F	1.26	F	1.26	F
3	Foothills Blvd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.13	F	1.13	F	1.09	F
4	Westside Dr	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.02	F	1.00	E	1.18	F
5	Fiddymment Rd	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.13	F	1.15	F	1.10	F
6	Westside Dr	Pleasant Grove Rd	0.61	B	0.61	B	0.70	B
7	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>0.91</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.95</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.93</u>	<u>E</u>
8	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>0.84</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.87</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.83</u>	<u>D</u>
9	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.01</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.02</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.02</u>	<u>F</u>
10	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>F</u>
11	<u>Foothills Blvd</u>	<u>Junction Blvd</u>	<u>1.06</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.08</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-84, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-37:

**TABLE 5-37
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION – WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project		Cumulative Plus Project Mitigated	
		Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,900</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,900</u>	<u>A</u>
Wise Road	East of McCourtney Road	9,000	A	12,200	B	12,500	B
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Gold Hill Rd</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,700</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>3,600</u>	<u>A</u>
Fruitvale Road	East of McCourtney Road	800	A	700	A	700	A
Nicolaus Road	West of Brewer Road	13,400	C	19,400	F	19,600	F
Nicolaus Road	East of Brewer Road	13,800	C	20,600	F	20,000	F
Virginiatown Road	East of McCourtney Road	8,400 <u>9,600</u>	A	7,400 <u>8,600</u>	A	8,600	A
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Brewer Road</u>	<u>2,500</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>5,100</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6,900</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>5,300</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6,900</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>5,300</u>	<u>A</u>
Catlett Road	West of Brewer Road	4,800	A	7,400	A	7,100	A
Catlett Road	East of Brewer Road	2,600	A	8,700	A	8,400	A
<u>Catlett Road</u>	<u>West of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>8,700</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>8,400</u>	<u>A</u>
Brewer Road	South of Catlett Road	14,900 <u>3,000</u>	D <u>A</u>	20,400 <u>8,400</u>	F <u>A</u>	3,000	A
<u>McCourtney Road</u>	<u>South of Wise Road</u>	<u>4,700</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>5,700</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>5,900</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>North of Wise Road</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,300</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>South of Riosa Road</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Fiddymont Road</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>39,900</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>71,500</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>55,000</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Fiddymont Road</u>	<u>North of Roseville City limit</u>	<u>53,800</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>54,700</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>52,800</u>	<u>E</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>28,900</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>34,000</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>30,100</u>	<u>D</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>North of Placer Corp Dr</u>	<u>40,600</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>42,300</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>38,000</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted roadway segments were not included in DEIR
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

On page 5-87, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-39:

**TABLE 5-39
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROCKLIN
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY AND WITH MITIGATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

#	Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			Cumulative Plus Project Conditions			Cumulative Plus Project Conditions With Mitigated Transportation Network		
	North – South	East - West	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS
1	Atherton Road West Stanford	Sunset Blvd	0.77		C	0.76		C	0.77		C
2	Ranch Rd	Sunset Blvd West Stanford	0.73		C	0.83		D	0.77		C
3	Wildcat Blvd	Ranch Rd	0.72		C	0.93		E	0.86		D
4	Park Dr	Sunset Blvd	0.94		E	0.99		E	0.97		E
5	Sierra College Blvd	Granite Dr	0.91		E	0.93		E	0.92		E
6	Sierra College Blvd	WB I-80 ramps		19.9	B		19.5	B		19.5	B
7	Sierra College Blvd	EB I-80 ramps		12.9	B		12.6	B		12.5	B
8	Sierra College Blvd	Valley View Pkwy	0.91		E	0.88		D	0.87		D
9	Wildcat Blvd	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	0.70		B	0.71		C	0.73		C
10	University Ave	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	0.92		E	0.89		D	0.92		E
<u>11</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.99</u>		<u>E</u>	<u>0.99</u>		<u>E</u>	<u>0.99</u>		<u>E</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>Stanford Ranch</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.72</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>0.77</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>0.74</u>		<u>C</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-90, make the following revisions to Table 5-41:

**TABLE 5-41
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY AND WITH
MITIGATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

#	Intersection		Cumulative Conditions		Cumulative Plus Project Conditions		Cumulative Plus Project With Mitigated Transportation Network	
	North - South	East - West	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
1	Foothills Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.23	F	1.24	F	1.19	F
2	Fiddymment Rd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.33	F	1.32	F	1.29	F
3	Foothills Blvd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.2	F	1.19	F	1.18	F
4	Westside Dr	Blue Oaks Blvd	1	E	1.01	F	1.17	F
5	Fiddymment Rd	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.26	F	1.36	F	1.19	F
6	Westside Dr	Pleasant Grove Rd	0.7	C	0.71	C	0.76	C
7	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.98</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.97</u>	<u>E</u>
8	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>0.98</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>0.97</u>	<u>E</u>
9	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.08</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.08</u>	<u>F</u>
10	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.15</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.14</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.13</u>	<u>F</u>
11	<u>Foothills Blvd</u>	<u>Junction Blvd</u>	<u>1.15</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.16</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.12</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-101, make the following additions and revisions to Table 5-45:

**TABLE 5-45
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY
2025 PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	2025 No Project		2025 Plus Project	
		Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>A</u>
Wise Road	East of McCourtney Road	10,000	A	12,400	B
<u>Wise Road</u>	<u>West of Gold Hill Rd</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>A</u>
Fruitvale Road	East of McCourtney Road	1,000	A	800	A
<u>Nicolaus Road</u>	<u>West of Brewer Road</u>	<u>12,400</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>18,600</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Nicolaus Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>12,800</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>20,300</u>	<u>F</u>

**TABLE 5-45
DAILY LEVELS OF SERVICE ON STUDY ROADWAYS IN UNINCORPORATED PLACER COUNTY
2025 PLUS PROJECT CONDITION**

Study Roadway	Roadway Section	2025 No Project		2025 Plus Project	
		Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service	Average Daily Traffic ¹	Level of Service
Virginiatown Road	East of McCourtney Road	7,900 <u>9,100</u>	A	8,200 <u>9,400</u>	A
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Brewer Road</u>	<u>2,500</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>8,200</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>East of Brewer Road</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>9,100</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Moore Road</u>	<u>West of Road "A"</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>9,100</u>	<u>A</u>
Catlett Road	West of Brewer Road	4,200	A	7,400	A
Catlett Road	East of Brewer Road	3,600	A	14,600	D
Brewer Road	South of Catlett Road	17,700 <u>1,600</u>	<u>E A</u>	23,900 <u>19,200</u>	F
<u>McCourtney Road</u>	<u>South of Wise Road</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6,100</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>North of Wise Road</u>	<u>1,100</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Dowd Road</u>	<u>South of Riosa Road</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>1,100</u>	<u>A</u>
<u>Fiddymont Road</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>29,000</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>38,000</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Fiddymont Road</u>	<u>North of Roseville City limits</u>	<u>38,800</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>38,800</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>South of Athens Avenue</u>	<u>17,900</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>22,700</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Industrial Ave</u>	<u>North of Placer Corp Dr</u>	<u>27,500</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>30,300</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted roadway segments were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

On page 5-105, make the following revisions to Table 5-47:

**TABLE 5-47
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROCKLIN
2025 PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY**

#	Intersection		2025 Conditions			2025 Plus Project Conditions		
	North - South	East - West	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS
1	Atherton Road	Sunset Blvd	0.56		A	0.67		B
2	West Stanford Ranch Rd	Sunset Blvd	0.83		D	1.02		F
3	Wildcat Blvd	West Stanford Ranch Rd	0.75		C	0.95		E
4	Park Dr	Sunset Blvd	0.95		E	1.01		F
5	Sierra College Blvd	Granite Dr	0.91		E	0.97		E
6	Sierra College Blvd	WB I-80 ramps		20.0	C		19.2	B
7	Sierra College Blvd	EB I-80 ramps		12.9	B		13.4	B
8	Sierra College Blvd	Valley View Pkwy	0.91		E	1.02		F

**TABLE 5-47
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROCKLIN
2025 PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY**

#	Intersection		2025 Conditions			2025 Plus Project Conditions		
	North - South	East - West	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS
9	Wildcat Blvd	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	0.67		B	0.79		C
10	University Ave	Whitney Ranch Pkwy	0.49		A	0.67		B
11	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.92</u>		<u>E</u>	<u>0.97</u>		<u>E</u>
12	<u>Stanford Ranch</u>	<u>Sunset Blvd</u>	<u>0.79</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>0.81</u>		<u>D</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

On page 5-108, make the following revisions to Table 5-49:

**TABLE 5-49
PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE AT STUDY AREA
INTERSECTIONS IN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
2025 PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY**

#	Intersection		2025 Conditions		2025 Plus Project Conditions	
	North - South	East - West	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
1	Foothills Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	1.09	F	1.15	F
2	Fiddymment Rd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.15	F	1.16	F
3	Foothills Blvd	Pleasant Grove Rd	1.11	F	1.11	F
4	Westside Dr	Blue Oaks Blvd	0.68	B	0.75	C
5	Fiddymment Rd	Blue Oaks Blvd	0.91	E	0.94	E
6	Westside Dr	Pleasant Grove Rd	0.57	A	0.45	A
7	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Blue Oaks Blvd</u>	<u>1.05</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.11</u>	<u>F</u>
8	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>0.84</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0.91</u>	<u>E</u>
9	<u>Washington Blvd</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.04</u>	<u>F</u>
10	<u>Roseville Pkwy</u>	<u>Pleasant Grove Blvd</u>	<u>1.10</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.14</u>	<u>F</u>
11	<u>Foothills Blvd</u>	<u>Junction Blvd</u>	<u>1.10</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>1.11</u>	<u>F</u>

Highlighted intersections were not included in DEIR

Source: DKS Associates, 2007

Chapter 6.0 Public Facilities and Services

On pages 6-28 – 6-29 of Chapter 6 (Section 6.5 “Solid Waste”) of the Draft EIR, the setting section has been edited as follows:

Solid waste generated in the City is collected and hauled by the City to the ~~WRSL) located on 320 acres at the southwest corner of Athens Road and Fiddyment Road~~ Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) located at 3033 Fiddyment Road. The solid waste is collected at curbside, typically in 90-gallon containers supplied by the City. In addition the City provides for green waste recycling with the use of curbside collection typically presented in 90 gallon containers and transported to the ~~WRSL, located on 281 acres at the southeast corner of Athens Road and Fiddyment Road~~. The landfill is owned by the WPWMA, which is comprised of the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln, and Placer County. The WRSL is a Class II and III non-hazardous landfill. The landfill has a remaining capacity of ~~14,011,000~~ 28,569,000 tons. In January ~~of 2004~~, WPWMA expanded the capacity of the landfill to 25.7 million cubic yards. The landfill is permitted for a maximum daily tonnage of 1,200 tons per day, and in 2002 received 219,109 tons.

The WPWMA also operates a Material Recovery Facility, which opened in November ~~of 1995~~ at the WRSL. The MRF separates and recovers waste products for recycling, reuse, or conversion to energy resources, as well as green waste for composting. In 2001, the MRF diverted 48,965 tons of materials from landfill disposal. The MRF is currently permitted for a maximum daily tonnage of ~~1,200~~ 1,750 tons per day. While the landfill can accept up to ~~1,200~~ 1,900 tons per day, the MRF is only able to process approximately 1,050 tons per day due to the limited size of the handling floor and the number of operating hours per day (12 hours Monday through Friday, with reduced hours on the weekend). If more than 1,050 tons comes to the facility in one day, the amount that cannot be processed in one day is processed the next day.

In May, 2003, the WPWMA approved a Capacity Enhancement Project, enabling staff to pursue revisions to existing permits to increase the landfill and MRF capacity. Implementation of this Proposed Project ~~would increase~~ resulted in an increase of the landfill’s maximum allowable daily tonnage from 1,200 to 1,900 tons/day. The permitted MRF tonnage ~~would increase~~ increased from 1,200 to 1,750 tons/day, and under the new permits the permitted peak daily number of vehicles at the MRF would be increased to 939. The MRF would also extend its processing hours to ~~16 hours (two full shifts)~~ 6:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. Monday through Sunday and would expand the handling floor. These improvements, coupled with several other improvements proposed as part of this Proposed Project, would allow the MRF to handle the proposed permitted 1,750 tons/day on a daily basis, with no surplus material carried over to the next day.

On page 6-32, make the following revision to Policy PFS-5.9:

PFS-5.9 Recycling of Hazardous Materials. The City shall ~~require~~ coordinate with the Placer County Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and support the proper disposal and recycling of hazardous materials. *[New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis]*

Chapter 8.0 Health and Safety

On pages 8-18, 8-20, and 8-23, make the following correction to the references to the Placer County Environmental Health Department:

8-18: For example, the Placer County Environmental Health ~~Services Department~~ Division suggested that the EIR should include an analysis of possible environmental and health risk impacts associated with agricultural-related contaminants.

8-20: Lists of contaminated sites within the study area are available through the Placer County Environmental Health ~~Services Department~~ Division, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Toxic Substance Control.

8-23: As more fully described above under Impact HS-9, Lists of contaminated sites within the study area are available through the Placer County Environmental Health ~~Services Department~~ Division, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Toxic Substance Control.

On page 8-20, add the following new text to the end of the first paragraph under Impact HS-9:

As discussed on page 8-27 of the Background Report, Placer County Environmental Health Division (PCEHD) serves as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Placer County. The CUPA program under the PCEHD provides a number of services pertaining to the collection of information regarding hazardous materials and waste use and storage in the County. Some of the CUPA program areas administered by PCEHD include Hazardous Materials Release Response Plan and Inventories (Business Plans), Underground Storage Tank Program, California Accidental Release Prevention Program, and Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment Program.

On pages 8-21, 8-22, and 8-24, make the following revision to mitigation measure HS-5.13:

- HS-5.13 Hazardous Materials Studies.** The City shall ensure that the proponents of development projects (including new, redevelopment, remodel, or demolition projects) address existing hazardous materials concerns through the preparation of Phase I or Phase II hazardous materials studies for each identified site as part of the design phase for each project. Particular attention should be paid to land that contained past agricultural uses. Recommendations outlined in the studies will be implemented as part of the construction phase for each project.

On pages 8-43, make the following revision to the second paragraph following Impact H-17:

The fundamental purpose of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is to promote land use compatibility around airports. The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) was established to ensure that there are no direct conflicts with land uses, noise, or other issues that would impact the functionality and safety of airport operations. To accomplish this, an ALUC has two specific

duties: 1) to prepare and adopt an airport land use plan and 2) to review agency land use plans, regulations, and other actions of local agencies and airport operators for consistency with that plan. One of the A key functions of the ALUC is to require that cities' and counties' general plans and zoning ordinances are consistent with Airport Environs Land Use Plans (AELUP's), which contain noise contours, restrictions for types of construction and building heights in navigable air space, as well as requirements impacting the establishment or construction of sensitive uses within close proximity to airports.

On page 8-44, make the following revision in the first paragraph:

To address a variety of noise issues, the Draft Health and Safety Element provides a number of policies that have been developed to address noise and land use compatibility issues associated with the Proposed Project. For example, policies have been developed to provide guidance on the analysis and mitigation of future project-related noise issues. These policies include identifying appropriate noise levels for sensitive receptors (Policies HS-8.1 and HS-8.2), noise compatibility guidelines (Policy HS-8.9), and identify the need for future project-specific noise studies (see Policy HS-8.14). Policies HS-8.10 and HS-8.11 require the consideration and use of a variety of sound attenuation features (including walls, landscaping, berms) to minimize noise impacts between various types of land uses and sensitive receptors. Additionally, Policy HS-8.5 requires the City to establish an ongoing noise monitoring program and Policy HS-8.6 requires that new development around the airport be consistent with the noise standards contained in the approved Airport Land Use Commission Plan, and where deemed appropriate, require ~~navigation~~ aviation easements from new development.

Chapter 10.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

On page 10-6, make the following revisions to Table 10-2:

**TABLE 10-2
SUMMARY OF KEY COMPONENTS FOR EACH ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative	Population	Residential Units/Village Areas	Estimated Total Acreage
Proposed Project	132,000	56,406 <u>55,370</u> dwelling units (Villages)	35,500 <u>33,000</u> acres
Alternative 1	65,300 <u>51,300</u>	<u>21,850</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	42,220 <u>14,000</u> acres
Alternative 2	66,500 <u>54,100</u>	24,228 <u>22,810</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	42,690 <u>15,000</u> acres
Alternative 3	84,000 <u>87,600</u>	32,870 <u>32,830</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	24,520 <u>22,000</u> acres
Alternative 4	406,000 <u>95,000</u>	42,430 <u>41,770</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	22,430 <u>23,000</u> acres
Alternative 5	120,000	56,290 <u>56,110</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	24,000 <u>23,000</u> acres
Alternative 6	130,000	<u>55,370</u> dwelling units (No Villages)	24,000 <u>23,000</u> acres

On page 10-13, make the following revision to the first paragraph:

...Continued implementation of this No-Project Alternative would also not likely result in as large a buildout population as that provided under the Proposed Project (see Table 10-2) and would not include any of the new policies and implementation measures designed to address the environmental impacts of future City development. Alternative 1 encompasses approximately ~~12,220~~ 14,000 acres and is presented in **Figure 10-1**.

On page 10-18, make the following revisions to the 4th paragraph:

...Growth anticipated under this alternative would result in a projected buildout population of ~~66,500~~ 54,100 people (see Table 10-2). Continued implementation of this No-Project Alternative would not include any of the new policies and implementation measures designed to address the environmental impacts of future City development. Alternative 2 encompasses approximately ~~12,690~~ 15,000 acres and is presented in **Figure 10-2**.

On page 10-27, make the following revisions to the 3rd paragraph:

Alternative 3 assumes that the City's existing Sphere of Influence as adopted by LAFCO is fully built-out with an assumed set of land uses that would include up to ~~32,870~~ 32,830 residential dwelling units (see Table 10-2), commercial and retail land uses. This alternative assumes no new growth outside the City's existing Sphere of Influence and continues to allow for a suburban form of land use development and does not use the principles of a Village design concept. Growth anticipated under this alternative would result in a projected buildout population of ~~84,000~~ 87,600 people (see Table 10-2). Implementation of this alternative would not include any of the new policies and implementation measures designed to address the environmental impacts of future City development. Alternative 3 encompasses approximately ~~21,520~~ 22,000 acres and is presented in **Figure 10-3**.

On page 10-45, make the following revisions to the 1st paragraph:

Land uses proposed under this alternative include a substantial increase in the City's inventory of commercial land (primarily focused on the Highway 65 Bypass corridor) and an expansion of residential land uses to the south of the corridor. Growth anticipated under this alternative would result in a projected buildout population of ~~106,000~~ 95,000 people (see Table 10-2).

On page 10-51, make the following revision to the 1st paragraph:

...Areas". While this alternative would still achieve the City's parkland and recreational facilities requirements, open space preservation requirements (40 percent or greater) would not be applicable under this alternative. Growth (predominately residential land uses) within the new development areas would be intensified (increased dwelling units in new areas) and result in a decreased need to convert existing open space/agricultural lands to urban uses. Additionally, the intensification of land uses within the City may potentially increase the feasibility of additional

inter-city transit service. As shown above in Table 10-2, this alternative would encompass an estimated ~~24,000~~ 23,000 acres and result in a projected buildout population of 120,000 people.

On page 10-58, make the following revisions to the second complete paragraph:

The Draft General Plan encompasses approximately ~~35,500~~ 33,000 acres to accommodate approximately 132,000 existing and future residents. One of the main goals of the Draft General Plan is “*to promote a strong economic and fiscal base critical to sustaining long-term prosperity for the residents and businesses in the City of Lincoln and the region.*” (Goal ED-1). The Draft General Plan’s fiscal analysis estimated that the City would need a population ranging between 120,000 to 130,000 persons in order to be economically sustainable and to provide the necessary municipal services at service levels expected by the City’s citizens. In response to this goal and to retain compatible land uses within the Lincoln Regional Airport ~~Overflight~~ Compatibility Zone, the Draft General Plan (Proposed Project) provides approximately 1,450 acres of new community and regional commercial land uses, 270 acres of new Business Professional land uses, 790 acres of new Industrial land uses and approximately 6,800 acres to accommodate 34,100 new residential dwelling units.

On page 10-58 make the following revisions to the last paragraph on the page:

The area encompassed by Alternative 6 is approximately ~~24,000~~ 23,000 acres (consisting of approximately 12,000 acres of existing city limits and ~~11,500~~ 11,000 acres of General Plan expansion) which is substantially less than the Proposed Project at ~~35,500~~ 33,000 acres. As shown above in Table 10-2, this alternative would result in a projected buildout population of approximately 130,000 people. The Rural Residential land uses south of the airport would remain in Alternative 6 as in the Proposed Project because this land use is the only type of residential use that is compatible with the airport ~~overflight~~ compatibility zone. The Draft General Plan designates approximately 1,450 acres of new community and regional commercial land uses on the south and west sides of the Lincoln Regional Airport along the future Highway 65 Bypass.

On page 10-65, make the following revisions to the 3rd paragraph:

A comparison of the population to the potential vehicle trips generated can be considered by comparing Alternative 4 – Highway 65 Bypass (with ~~106,000~~ 95,000 persons at buildout) to Alternative 5 – Increased Density (with 120,000 persons at buildout). Both alternatives include similar boundaries. The total trips generated by Alternative 4 are projected at 529,000 trips while the total trips generated by Alternative 5 are projected at 695,000 trips.

Recirculated Draft EIR

Section 2.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change

On page 2.3-9, make the following revision to the last paragraph:

In addition to the above mentioned policies and implementation measures, the following new policies Policy HS-3.21 “Shade Tree Informational Packet”, Policy OSC-3.16 ~~LU-15.9~~ “Alternative Fuels Vehicle Parking”...

On page 2.3-10, make the following revisions to the policy:

- **Policy OSC-3.16 ~~LU-15.9~~ Alternative Fuels Vehicle Parking.** The City shall prioritize ~~prioritized~~ parking within commercial and retail areas for electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles as well as provide electric charging stations. *[New Policy – Revised Final EIR]*

On page 2.3-11, make the following revision to the first paragraph:

As stated above, the City will adopt and implement a wide variety of policies and implementation measures (including new policies HS-3.21 “Shade Tree Informational Packet”, Policy OSC-3.16 ~~LU-15.9~~ “Alternative Fuels Vehicle Parking”...