
4. Corrections and Revisions to the Recirculated DEIR

4.1 Introduction

This chapter shows revisions to the Recirculated DEIR, subsequent to the document's publication and public review. The revisions are presented in the order in which they appear in the Recirculated DEIR and are identified by page number in respective chapters. These revisions are shown as excerpts from the Recirculated DEIR, with strikethrough (~~strikethrough~~) text to indicate deletions and underlined (underlined) text to indicate additions.

4.2 Text Revisions

4.2.1 Chapter 2, Project Description

4.2.1.1 Recycled Water Funding, Section 2.3.4.2, page 2-14

A statement related to the funding of recycled water facilities has been corrected, as shown below:

2.3.4.2 Sanitary Sewer

South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) would serve the project site. SPMUD operates under a joint powers agreement between the City of Roseville, SPMUD, and Placer County. The regional facilities funded by SPMUD include ~~recycled water facilities~~, trunk sewer lines, and two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). All three member agencies transmit wastewater to these WWTPs.

4.2.1.2 Construction Phasing, Section 2.4, page 2-26

Section 2.4, "Construction and Phasing," page 2-26 of the Recirculated EIR Project Description has been revised to include additional detail related to the planned phasing of the proposed project.

2.4 Construction and Phasing

The proposed project would be constructed in a single phase over a period of 6 months, opening in late 2020 or early 2021. Grading and site preparation would take two months to complete. Utility installation, paving, and erection of the structure would follow over a two-month time frame. Construction would conclude with the application of architectural coatings and installation of landscaping during a one-month period. Construction activities will occur in distinct, non-overlapping phases, as listed below.

- Phase 1: Rough Grade
- Phase 2: Paving (Includes Base for Paving, Asphalt, and Concrete Foundations)
- Phase 3: Building Erection
- Phase 4: Architectural Coatings

4.2.2 Section 3.3, Air Quality

4.2.2.1 Construction Phasing Mitigation, Impact 3.3-1, page 3.3-17

A mitigation measure has been added under Impact 3.3-1, page 3.3-17 of the Recirculated DEIR to include detailed requirements for construction phasing to ensure that emissions do not exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance.

As demonstrated above, the project would have a less-than-significant impact related to short-term, construction-related emissions. The following mitigation measure has been added for planning purposes.

Mitigation Measure Air Quality-1: Implement Construction Phasing.

As part of the building permit application, the project applicant shall include the construction schedule, which will reflect the below phasing. Activities associated with distinct phases shall not overlap. If any overlap of construction activities should be required, the project applicant shall demonstrate that emissions from construction activities shall not exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance.

Construction Phasing: Construction activities will occur in distinct, non-overlapping phases, as listed below.

- Phase 1: Rough Grade
- Phase 2: Paving (Includes Base for Paving, Asphalt, and Concrete Foundations)
- Phase 3: Building Erection
- Phase 4: Architectural Coatings

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure Air Quality-1 would ensure that construction activities do not overlap and result in a greater intensity of daily construction equipment and vehicle use that could cause emissions to exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance. With implementation of mitigation, this impact would be **less than significant**.

4.2.2.2 Health Risk Assessment, Page 3.3-21

The Health Risk Assessment, conducted to support the EIR, has been revised to account for changes to the site plan that move some heavy truck trips away from sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. The already less-than-significant impact is further reduced. The revised analysis is for Site Plan Option 1D – both with and without a southern Granite Drive access.

Health Risk Results – Option 1A

Table 3.3-9 presents the locations and cancer risks for the off-site maximum exposed individual resident (MEIR) and the maximum exposed individual worker (MEIW) for the proposed project Option 1A scenario. At the MEIR, cancer risk is calculated on a 30-year basis for an adult, and on a 9-year basis for a child, to account for variable residence times. Cancer risk for the MEIW is calculated on a 25-year exposure basis assuming most workers will be present during the same hours as fueling station operation. For Site Plan Option 1D (assuming no southern Granite Drive access), the results would be reduced: for operations, the 30-resident result is 1.59 in one million instead of 2.80; for the 9-year old child, the result is 1.15 in one million instead of 2.05; for the 25-year off-site worker, the result is 3.45 in one million instead of 4.05. The total cancer risk is 5.80 in one million instead of 6.98 for the 30-year resident; 5.36 in one million instead of 6.27 for the 9-year old child; and 3.57 instead of 4.17 for the 25-year off-site worker.

If a southern Granite Drive access is provided in the future, the overall cancer risk would be reduced compared to that presented in the Recirculated DEIR, too. For the 30-resident, the risk for construction is

3.96 instead of 4.22 and for operations, the risk is 1.58 instead of 2.80; for the 9-year old child, the risk for construction is 3.96 instead of 4.22 and the risk during operations is 1.14 instead of 2.05; for the 25-year off-site worker, the risk during construction is 0.10 instead of 0.12 and the risk during operations is 3.45 instead of 4.05. The total cancer risk is 5.54 instead of 6.98 for the 30-year resident; 5.10 instead of 6.27 for the 9-year old child; and 3.55 instead of 4.17 for the 25-year off-site worker.

Table 3.3-10 presents the locations and chronic non-cancer HI for the Point of Maximum Impact (PMI), the MEIR, and the MEIW. For Site Plan Option 1D, the chronic non-cancer risk hazard index is the same as that presented in the 2019 RDEIR for Options 1A, 1B, and 1C.

4.2.2.3 Health Risk Assessment, Page 3.3-21

The Health Risk Assessment, conducted to support the EIR, has been revised to account for changes to the site plan that move nighttime heavy truck trips away from sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. The already less-than-significant impact is further reduced. The revised analysis is for Site Plan Option 1D – both without a southern Granite Drive access open and with this site access open.

Table 3.3-11 presents the locations and 8-hour chronic HIs for the PMI, the MEIR, and the MEIW. For Site Plan Option 1D, the 8-hour chronic non-cancer risk index is the same as that presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR for Options 1A, 1B, and 1C.

Table 3.3-12 presents the locations and acute HI for the PMI, the MEIR, and the MEIW. For Site Plan Option 1D, the acute non-cancer risk index is the same as that presented in the 2019 RDEIR for Options 1A, 1B, and 1C, except that the result for the maximally individual resident (MEIR) for Option 1D is 0.09 instead of 0.10, as reported for Options 1A, 1B, and 1C, and except that the HI for the PMI is 0.25 for Option 1D instead of 0.26, as reported for Option 1A.

4.2.3 Section 3.4, Biological Resources

Minor revision to Mitigation Measure Bio-1

The word “and” has been included instead of the word “or” at the end of this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure Bio-1: Prepare and Implement an Oak Woodland Open Space Mitigation Plan.

Before issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall prepare an oak woodland mitigation plan for review and approval by the Town of Loomis that describes the methods by which a minimum of 7.96 acres of valley oak woodland within the Dry Creek watershed shall be conserved and protected as natural open space. The mitigation lands shall provide wildlife habitat values equal to or better than those at the project site, as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. The oak woodland mitigation plan can be implemented by securing a conservation easement to protect, enhance, and manage a minimum of 7.96 acres of valley oak woodland. Fees for implementing the conservation easement shall be calculated based on the Passive Park/Open Space Fee and current market value for preservation of similar oak woodland acreage within the Dry Creek watershed. The fees shall include endowment funds sufficient to manage the land in perpetuity to maintain the wildlife values of the oak woodland habitat.

The oak woodland mitigation land shall be transferred, through either a conservation easement or fee title, to a third-party, nonprofit conservation organization (known as the Conservation Operator), with the Town named as a third-party beneficiary. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt, nonprofit conservation organization that meets the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and shall be selected or approved by the Town, after coordination with CDFW. The Town, after coordinating with CDFW and the Conservation Operator, shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The Town and the Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to ensure compliance with the terms of the easement.

Before grading permits for the project site are issued, the project applicant shall provide evidence to the Town of Loomis that the conservation easement has been recorded, and ~~or~~ shall provide financial assurances to guarantee that adequate funding is available to implement the oak woodland open space mitigation plan described above.

4.2.4 Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gases

The Town has added Mitigation Measure GHG-1b, as shown below, consistent with a recommendation from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (page 3.5-13).

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Purchase and Retire GHG Emissions Credits.

- Prior to the issuance of a permit of occupancy, the project applicant shall develop a GHG emissions credit plan, for review and approval by the Town, demonstrating consistency with the requirements of this mitigation measure, including the specific criteria outlined below regarding the credit program selected. The Town shall share the GHG emissions credit plan with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) for review and comment.
- The project applicant shall purchase and retire GHG emissions credits in an amount sufficient to reduce the project's net construction and operational emissions to a level considered less than cumulatively considerable using significance thresholds recommended by the PCAPCD through the year 2050 or through the end of the operational life of the project, if the project ceases operations prior to 2050. The current relevant threshold is 27.3 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MT CO₂e/year), and the current minimum total required credits is 14,315 MT CO₂e for the life of the project, but the purchase of credits under this mitigation measure shall be consistent with PCAPCD-recommended significance thresholds, including as these recommended significance thresholds may be revised in the future, as long as credits are purchased in an amount sufficient to reduce the project's net construction and operational emissions to a level considered less than cumulatively considerable using PCAPCD-recommended significance thresholds.
- The purchase and retirement of credits may occur through an applicant-commissioned off-site mitigation project or purchased through one of the following: (i) a California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard; (ii) any registry approved by CARB to act as a registry under the California Cap and Trade program; or (iii) through the CAPCOA GHG Rx and the PCAPCD. Such credits shall be based on protocols approved by CARB, consistent with Section 95972 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, and shall not allow the use of offset projects originating outside of California, except to the extent that the quality of the offsets, and their sufficiency under the standards set forth herein, can be verified by the Town of Loomis and/or the PCAPCD. Off-site mitigation credits shall be real, additional, quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, permanent, consistent with the standards set forth in Health and Safety Code section 38562, subdivisions (d)(1) and (d)(2) and that satisfy all of the following criteria:
 - Real: emission reduction must have actually occurred, yielding quantifiable and verifiable reductions or removals determined using appropriate, accurate, and conservative methodologies that account for all GHG emissions sources, GHG sinks, and GHG reservoirs within the offset project boundary and account for uncertainty and the potential for activity-shifting leakage and market-shifting leakage.
 - Additional: an emission reduction cannot be required by an existing law, rule, or other requirement that applies directly to the proposed project, or otherwise have occurred in a conservative business-as-usual scenario, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c)(3).
 - Quantifiable: reductions must be quantifiable through tools or tests that are reliable, based on applicable methodologies, relative to the project baseline in a reliable and replicable manner for all GHG emission sources and recorded with adequate documentation.

- Verifiable: the action taken to produce credits can be audited by an accredited verification body and there is sufficient evidence to show that the reduction occurred and was quantified correctly.
- Enforceable: an enforcement mechanism must exist to ensure that the reduction project is implemented correctly.
- Permanent: emission reductions or removals must continue to occur for the expected life of the reduction project (i.e., not be reversible, or if the reductions may be reversible, that mechanisms are in place to replace any reversed GHG emissions reductions).
- The purchase and retirement of credits shall be prior to the start of each operational year at a level necessary to ensure that annual operational emissions and amortized construction emissions remain below current recommended threshold levels recommended by PCAPCD for that year. Purchase and retirement of credits can also occur for multiple years in advance.
- The applicant shall provide the Town and the PCAPCD with evidence of the purchase and retirement of credits in adequate amounts and appropriate timing.

4.2.5 Section 3.7, Transportation and Traffic

4.2.5.1 Brace Road Functional Classification, Page 3.7-3

The functional classification of Brace Road has been corrected on page 3.7-3:

Within the Town of Loomis, **Brace Road** is an east-west roadway classified as a low access control arterial from Sierra College Boulevard across I-80 to Horseshoe Bar Road. ~~Brace Road is a minor street that begins at Taylor Road and continues east over I-80.~~ This two-lane road provides secondary access to the project site. Improvements planned for Brace Road include providing curbs, gutters, bike lanes, and sidewalks on both sides from Sierra College Boulevard to I-80 and widening the roadway to standard width with 3-foot shoulders east of I-80 (Town of Loomis 2016). Costco will also provide a raised median between the Sierra College Boulevard intersection and the proposed right in/right out Costco driveway on Brace Road, maintaining access to Homewood Lumber.

4.2.6 Section 3.6, Noise

Revisions have been made to the following paragraphs from page 3.6-16 to adjust the distance relative to the apartment building and to adjust the hourly noise level, which decreases because the assumed speed was adjusted to 15 miles per hour to more realistic, and to reflect the fact that truck deliveries at nighttime are prohibited from using the Brace Road access:

Deliveries to the warehouse under all three Project Driveway Access Options would occur exclusively from an entry off Brace Road, west of and adjacent to the existing noise-sensitive apartment building. Warehouse delivery trucks would enter the site approximately ~~75~~ 50 feet from the apartment building façade on Brace Road and exit at the driveway on Sierra College Boulevard (Option 1A) or at the new Granite Driveway Access (Option 1B and Option 1C). Warehouse shipments would be received between 2 a.m. and 9 p.m., and average 10 to 13 trips per day with most deliveries completed by 10 a.m.

Fueling station deliveries under all ~~three~~ options would enter and exit the site from the Costco driveway on Sierra College Boulevard. Five to seven fuel deliveries are anticipated per day on average. During busy holiday weeks, an additional delivery is often required during the day. These deliveries occur any time between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.; however, these deliveries would not occur near sensitive receptors.

Policy 18 of the Town of Loomis General Plan Public Health and Safety Element requires that the hours of truck deliveries to industrial and commercial properties adjacent to residential uses be limited to daytime hours unless there is no feasible alternative or there are overriding transportation

benefits by scheduling deliveries at night. In order to limit the impact of heavy truck trips to level of service at study intersections, Costco plans to conduct warehouse deliveries during the nighttime hours, with up to three trucks per hour, resulting in an hourly noise level of 54 dBA Leq at the apartment building façade. The primary noise sources associated with the truck unloading areas are the heavy trucks stopping (air brakes), backing into the loading docks (backup alarms), pulling out of the loading docks (engines accelerating), and short-term refrigeration unit operation.

Instantaneous maximum noise levels attributable to delivery trucks entering or exiting the project site under all three options would be approximately 75 dBA L_{max} at the apartment building façade. Existing daytime noise levels at adjacent residential uses east of the project site's delivery access points were measured to be 64 dBA Leq and 82 dBA L_{max}. The increase from existing noise levels at these residential uses attributable to the proposed project's delivery trucks would be negligible. All truck deliveries entering and exiting the project site between 10pm and 7am are restricted to the exclusive use of the Sierra College Boulevard driveway and shall not use the Brace Road access. ~~however, nighttime interior noise levels may exceed noise standards for short durations during each delivery. Therefore~~ However, based on the anticipated noise levels, this impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure Noise-2 (page 3.6-17) has been revised, as shown below:

Mitigation Measure Noise-2: Minimize Operational Noise (All Site Options)

Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project applicant shall construct or fund construction of the following improvements to address noise exposure experienced at sensitive receptors during operational hours:

- Construct a 13-foot tall soundwall along the western property boundary of the adjacent Sierra Meadows apartment complex in order to shield first floor sensitive spaces from ~~nighttime~~ truck delivery noise generated by diesel engines and exhaust stacks.
- Install dual pane windows with an STC rating of 35 or higher at second floor apartment units facing the delivery road in order to reduce interior noise levels ~~attributable to nighttime truck deliveries.~~
- Construct a ~~68~~-foot soundwall along the eastern boundary of the project site at the residential property line to ~~reduce tire center noise.~~
- All truck deliveries entering and exiting the project site between 10pm and 7am are restricted to the exclusive use of the Sierra College Boulevard driveway and shall not use the Brace Road access.
- The operation of parking lot cleaning equipment shall be restricted to the hours between 7am and 7pm.
- Noise-generating parking lot cleaning equipment shall not be used at the same time as noise-generating landscape maintenance equipment within 100 feet of the property line of any occupied residential use.
- Noise-generating parking lot cleaning equipment and noise-generating landscape maintenance equipment shall not be used for more than 5 minutes per hour within 100 feet of the property line of any occupied residential use.
- The tire center doors shall be closed whenever pneumatic wrenches and tire breakers are used, to the maximum extent feasible.

A revision has been made to correct the estimate of noise associated with the tire center on pages 3.6-16 and 3.6-17:

An automotive tire shop is part of the proposed project, introducing a new nontransportation noise source to the adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. Based on the project description (see Chapter 2

of this EIR), the automotive repair shop would be located on the east side of the proposed building. The bay doors would face the adjacent noise-sensitive land uses; however, all repair activities would be conducted within the building. The nearest noise-sensitive property line is approximately 260 feet from the automotive bay doors. Typical noise sources for this type of use are pneumatic wrenches and tire breakers, with an hourly operational noise level of 61 dBA Leq at 100 feet. Noise emanating from the tire repair shop is anticipated to attenuate to ~~57~~ 53 dBA Leq with roll up door open and, conservatively, based on an assumed 5 dB attenuation, ~~48~~ 52 dBA Leq with roll up door closed at the nearest noise-sensitive property line.

Additional noise analysis has been added to page 3.6-17 to describe the effect of multiple noise sources at the project site.

Also, all the sources assessed above in various locations within the site, could possibly occur simultaneously or at different times; consequently, exposing nearby sensitive uses to combined noise levels from two or more than two noise sources. When a noise source doubles, it would result in a change of (3 dB) (Caltrans 2013). A decibel is logarithmic; it does not follow normal algebraic methods and cannot be directly added. For example, a 65-dB source of sound, such as a truck, when joined by another 65 dB source results in a sound amplitude of 68 dB, not 130 dB (i.e., doubling the source strength increases the sound pressure by 3 dB). Potential combined noise sources at nighttime would be HVAC and truck delivery at night. Noise levels from commercial HVAC equipment can reach 100 dBA at a distance of 3 feet (EPA 1974). HVAC noise, assuming it would be installed at 60 feet away from the noise sensitive uses, would be 74 dB. As discussed above, the proposed project would include a mechanical room where HVAC components would be housed and would provide adequate shielding from receiving noise-sensitive land uses to the east and north. The HVAC shielding would at least provide 25-dB reduction in noise. This would result in reduced noise level of 49 dB.

Truck delivery noise would be approximately 52 dB Leq at 50 feet. Since nighttime deliveries would use the Sierra College Boulevard driveway, noise would be shielded by the proposed building, and the proposed building would provide at least 10 dB of noise reduction. This would result in a noise level of 42 dB at the nearest sensitive uses (the apartments). Adding the HVAC noise level of 49 dB and truck noise level of 42 dB would result in total level of 50 dB at the sensitive uses. As described above, existing ambient noise levels currently exceed the Town of Loomis's exterior daytime and nighttime average hourly noise level standards of 50 dBA Leq and 40 dBA Leq, respectively, and the ambient noise level then becomes the accepted noise level standard and significance threshold. Existing daytime noise levels at adjacent residential uses north of the project site (apartments) were measured to be 54 dBA. Existing nighttime noise levels measured 50 dBA Leq. Therefore, the project noise level of 50 dB at the exterior uses of the nearest sensitive uses (apartments) would not exceed the applicable threshold.

The daytime noise sources in the project area would include operation of the proposed HVAC system, truck delivery, tire shop noise, parking lot noise, parking lot cleaning/sweeping, and landscape maintenance, as well as transportation noise in the vicinity of the project site. A composite noise analysis combines project-related noise levels based on the location of the noise sources, the number of noise sources at each location, and the effects at the nearest noise sensitive uses. Noise sensitive uses are located north and east of the project site. The apartments north of the project site would be shielded by the proposed building from the noise sources occurring south of the building. The noise sensitive uses the east of the project site, would be shielded by the proposed building form the noise sources occurring at the northwestern portions of the project site.

Typical noise sources for the tire shop would include pneumatic wrenches and tire breakers, with an hourly operational noise level of 61 dBA Leq at 100 feet. Noise emanating from the tire repair shop is anticipated to attenuate to 53 dBA Leq at the nearest noise-sensitive property line. Assuming that each parking space adjacent to a residential use would be filled and emptied during the peak hour (for a total of 160–200 parking events), the noise level would be 52 dBA Leq at 65 feet from the center of the parking space cluster to the nearest noise-sensitive use (residential properties to the east). The tire shop activities and parking lot noise would result in 56 dB combined

noise level at the property line of residential properties to the east of the project site – noise levels for the apartment building to the north would be shielded by the proposed building and soundwall. The proposed soundwall along the eastern perimeter would reduce noise levels by at least 5 dB, which would decrease this combined noise level to approximately 51 dB. Keeping the tire center doors closed would substantially reduce noise levels, and this requirement has been added to Mitigation Measure Noise-2 to ensure compliance with Table 8-4 of the General Plan.

The noise level from a vacuum street sweeper would be 70 dBA Leq at 50 feet (FHWA 2006). Noise level from lawn mower would be 95 dB at 3 feet (Table 3.6-1, Caltrans 2013). A drop-off rate of 7.5 dB per doubling of distance is typically observed over soft ground with landscaping. Therefore, landscaping noise at the nearest sensitive uses located at approximately 30 feet to the east of parking lot would be 70 dB. If parking lot cleaning and landscaping activities occurred simultaneously directly adjacent to residential properties, this would result in 73 dB combined noise level at the sensitive uses. This would exceed the General Plan standard of 65 dBA for outdoor activity areas that are directly adjacent to the proposed project site. This would also exceed the short-term noise standards in the General Plan (Table 8-4). However, the proposed soundwall for residential properties to the east would reduce noise levels by at least 5 dB. If the parking lot cleaning did not occur simultaneously with the landscape maintenance, the noise sources would not be combined. If landscape maintenance and parking lot cleaning is limited to no more than 5 minutes in the areas directly adjacent to residential properties, with the construction of the soundwall along the eastern perimeter, the project would be consistent with Table 8-4 of the General Plan, which allows noise levels of up to 65 dB for up to 5 minutes per hour. The 2019 RDEIR evaluates impacts of the project relative to local (Town) standards, which would include an assessment of consistency with Table 8-4 of the General Plan. These requirements are required as a part of Mitigation Measure Noise-2.

Additional noise analysis has been added to pages 3.6-17 and 3.6-18 to describe the benefits of revised mitigation.

Significance after Mitigation

Complying with the noise policies of the Town of Loomis General Plan as described in Mitigation Measure Noise-2 would allow the project applicant, the construction contractor(s), and the Town of Loomis to address problems that arise during operation, to the extent feasible. These approaches have been shown to be effective in reducing temporary and long-term operational impacts. Solid walls, berms, or elevation differences typically reduce noise levels by 5.0 to 10.0 dB(A).

Implementing Mitigation Measure Noise-2 would reduce the impact related to operational noise to a less-than-significant level, because interior noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive uses would not exceed adopted standards during individual delivery truck movements with the inclusion of a soundwall, and since no nighttime deliveries would occur adjacent to residential properties and second floor window upgrades. Effective noise barriers typically reduce noise levels by 5 to 10 decibels (dB) (FHWA 2017).

Noise associated with delivery trucks in the worst-case location would be approximately 75 dBA Lmax at the adjacent apartment building the average sound-level reduction would be 15 dB with windows open and 25 dB with windows closed (EPA 1974), so noise levels would be between 50 dBA and 60 dBA during a delivery, ~~which are expected to occur during noise sensitive nighttime hours.~~ Installation of dual-pane windows would reduce noise levels further, ~~but even if this improvement was not made, approximately one percent of individuals would be anticipated to be awakened by a SEL of 50 dBA and 1.5 percent would be awakened by a SEL of 60 dBA (Finegold and Bartholomew 2004).~~ Material with an STC rating of 35 has a transmission loss (reduction in noise) of about 25 to 30 dBA for traffic noise (Caltrans 2013).

Additionally, Mitigation Measure Noise-2 would reduce the tire center noise impact to a less-than-significant level because exterior noise levels at adjacent residential uses to the east would be below the thresholds with the inclusion of a soundwall and also located farther away than the residences to the north. The combination of mitigation measures will reduce noise exposure to a

level that is consistent with applicable local standards—the combination of dual pane windows with an STC rating of 36 or higher and a sound wall would reduce the interior noise to 40 dB or less. But, the installation of dual pane windows with an STC rating of 36 or higher at second floor apartment units facing the delivery road cannot be guaranteed since neither the Town nor the applicant own this property. Therefore, the impact is less than significant with mitigation and unavoidable.

3.6.5 Significance after Mitigation

Implementing Mitigation Measures Noise-1 and Noise-2 would reduce project-related impacts under all ~~three~~ Project Driveway Access Options but not all noise impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The Town cannot demonstrate at this time that implementing these mitigation measures would enable the proposed project to avoid a substantial temporary, short-term increase in ambient noise levels due to construction, or that it would fully reduce the construction short-term impacts to a less-than-significant level. No additional feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, Impact 3.6-1 would be significant and unavoidable.

Noise associated with delivery trucks entering or exiting the project site under all ~~three~~ options could exceed applicable standards at the adjacent apartment building under all of the access options. Noise levels at residential uses attributable to the proposed project's tire center could cause a temporary or periodic noise-level increase. Implementing Mitigation Measure Noise-2 would reduce the impact related to operational noise to a less-than-significant level, ~~but the installation of dual pane windows with an STC rating of 36 or higher at second floor apartment units facing the delivery road cannot be guaranteed since neither the Town nor the applicant own this property. No additional feasible mitigation is available.~~ Therefore, the impact is less than significant with mitigation and unavoidable.

4.2.7 Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts

4.2.7.1 Table 4-10, page 4-19

There is an error in the summary of mitigation measures in Table 4-10 of the Recirculated DEIR related to the Sierra College Boulevard/Granite Drive intersection. The mitigation measures identified in Table 4-10 of the Recirculated DEIR for the Sierra College Boulevard/Granite Drive intersection has been amended to reflect the mitigation measures summarized in Table 65 of the Loomis Costco Transportation Impact Analysis.

Table 4-1. Cumulative Short Term plus Project – Mitigation Measures

ID	Intersection	Option(s) Requiring Mitigation	Jurisdiction	Impact Type	Current Traffic Control	Mitigation Measure	Specific Actions Recommended	Effects of Mitigation
8	Sierra College Boulevard & Granite Drive	Option 1A	Rocklin	LOS/Queue	Signal	TR MM 2: Provide signal coordination TR MM 4: Restripe Intersection	Restripe northbound right turn lane to shared through-right lane. Restripe the southbound right-turn lane to a shared through right lane. Provide eastbound right-turn overlap phasing. Coordinate signal timing with I-80 ramps (120 seconds for AM peak hour, 135 seconds for PM peak hour, and 130 seconds for the MD peak hour). Optimize eye length with.	Provides additional through lane, allowing more vehicles to travel through the intersection. Provides additional left turn lane, allowing more vehicles to turn left during each signal phase.
8	Sierra College Boulevard & Granite Drive	Options 1B, 1C	Rocklin	LOS/Queue	Signal	TR MM 2: Provide signal coordination TR MM 4: Restripe Intersection	Restripe the southbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right lane. Restripe westbound through lane to left turn and restripe westbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right lane. Provide eastbound right-turn overlap phasing. Coordinate signal timing with I-80 ramps (120	Provides additional through lane, allowing more vehicles to travel through the intersection. Provides additional left turn lane,

seconds for AM peak hour, 136 seconds for PM peak hour, and 130 seconds for MD peak hour). allowing more vehicles to turn left during each signal phase,

4.2.7.2 Table 4-19, page 4-31

After conducting additional operational and queuing analysis, the mitigation presented for the Sierra College Boulevard/Project Driveway Option 1A in Table 68 of the Transportation Impact Analysis and Recirculated DEIR Table 4-19 has been revised, as shown below.

Table 4-2. Cumulative Long Term plus Project – Mitigation Measures

ID	Intersection	Project Option(s) Requiring Mitigation	Jurisdiction	Impact Type	Current Traffic Control	Mitigation Measure	Specific Actions Recommended	Effects of Mitigation
24	Sierra College Boulevard & Project Dwy	Options 1A	Loomis	Queue	Signal	TR MM 2: Provide signal coordination	Coordinate signal timing with Granite Drive and I-80 ramps (match cycle length in use on Sierra College Boulevard at Granite Drive and Brace Road).	Provides better progression through corridor
24	Sierra College Boulevard & Project Dwy	Options 1B, 1C	Loomis	Queue	Signal	TR MM 7: Add storage to turn pockets	Modify median to provide additional storage (<u>225 feet total</u>) for southbound left turn lane (Project to implement with Sierra College Boulevard roadway widening along Project frontage).	Creates longer turn pockets to hold more vehicles

4.2.8 Appendix B, CalEEMod Air Quality Emissions Modeling & Health Risk Assessment

Note “a” on the Table on page 6 of 242 of Appendix B labeled “Operational Emissions Summary” has been corrected, as shown below:

- a. Operational emissions were modeled for year ~~2018~~ 2020.