TOWN OF LOOMIS

RESOLUTION NO. 01-24

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF LOOMIS CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT RELATING TO THE TOWN OF LOOMIS GENERAL PLAN 2001, ADOPTING THE 2001 GENERAL PLAN, MAKING FINDINGS OF FACT RELATING TO THE FEASIBILITY OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND PROJECT ALTERNATIVES, ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN AND ISSUING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS IDENTIFYING THE BENEFITS OF THE GENERAL PLAN THAT RENDER ACCEPTABLE ITS SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

WHEREAS, the Town of Loomis is proposing to adopt the Town of Loomis General Plan 2001 in accordance with Government Code Section 65300 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), consisting of a Draft EIR, a Response to Comments and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan, has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to analyze the Projects' environmental effects; and

WHEREAS, Town staff has independently reviewed, evaluated, and participated in preparing the Draft and Final EIRS, and

WHEREAS, the Town Council of the Town of Loomis has reviewed the FEIR, the Loomis General Plan 2001, and public and agency comments, as well as Planning Department staff reports, addressing and pertaining to both the FEIR and the General Plan, all of which are hereby incorporated by reference into this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR identified certain significant and potentially significant adverse effects on the environment caused by the General Plan 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council is generally required, pursuant to CEQA, to adopt all feasible mitigation measures or any feasible environmentally superior project alternative that can substantially lessen or avoid any significant environmental effects; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council desires, in accordance with CEQA, to declare that, despite the occurrence of significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives, there exist certain overriding economic, social and other considerations for approving the General Plan 2001 that the Town Council believes justify the occurrence of those effects; and

WHEREAS, the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Town Council bases this approval and these findings are located with the Town Clerk, Loomis Town Hall, 1640 Horseshoe Bar Road, Suite K, Loomis, California 95650 (iin compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 (a)(2) and 14 Cal Code Regs Section 15091(e));

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Town Council of the Town of Loomis as follows:

1. It is hereby certified that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;

2. It is hereby certified that the EIR has been presented to the Planning Commission for its consideration on May 16, 2000;

3. It is hereby certified that the Draft EIR and Final EIR were presented to the Town Council at a public hearing on June 8, 2000, November 3, 2000 and May 22, 2001, and that Town Council reviewed and considered the information and analysis contained therein before making the findings attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and before issuing the statement overriding considerations attached hereto as Exhibit "B";

4. It is hereby certified that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Town of Loomis;

5. As set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, the Council hereby finds, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, that the proposed mitigation measures described in the Final EIR are feasible, and therefore will become binding upon the Town and affected landowners and their assigns or successors in interest when the Council approves the General Plan;

6. As set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, the Council hereby finds that none of the proposed project alternatives set forth in the Final EIR can substantially lessen or avoid the significant adverse environmental effects that are contemplated even after the adoption and implementation of all feasible mitigation measures;

7. In order to comply with Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the Town hereby adopts the mitigation monitoring plan included in the Final EIR, as Exhibit "C";

8. Because even adoption of all feasible mitigation measures will not substantially lessen or avoid all significant adverse environmental effects caused by adoption of the General Plan, the Council hereby issues, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093 and as set forth in Exhibit "B" attached hereto, a statement of overriding considerations identifying the specific economic, social, and other considerations that render those effects acceptable.

9. It is further certified that none of the Council members own property within 300 feet of property which is the subject of new or different designations or policies as a result of adopting this General Plan update; and it is further certified by each Council member who may own property within 2500 feet of property which is the subject of such new or different designations or policies, that the fair market value of their property will not increase or decrease by $10,000 or increase or decrease said fair market rent by $1,000 in any 12 month period.

10. The 2001 General Plan is hereby adopted in its' entirety as presented.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the Town of Loomis this 31st day of July, 2001 by the following vote:

AYES:	Hineline, Hollis, Morillas, Ucovich
NOES:	Scherer
ABSENT:	None

Mayor

ATTEST:

Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Town Attorney

EXHIBIT "A"

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE FEASIBILITY OF PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES FOR THE 2001 LOOMIS GENERAL PLAN

Section 1: INTRODUCTION

The process by which the 2001 Loomis General Plan was adopted has been in accordance with the legal provisions and principles governing general plans and the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

Government Code section 65300 requires each city and town in California to adopt "a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the ... city, and of any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency's judgment bears relation to its planning." A general plan shall consist, at a minimum, of the seven "mandatory elements" specified in Government Code section 65302: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open-space, noise, and safety. A general plan may also include "any other elements or [may] address any other subjects which in the judgment of the legislative body, [is] related to the physical development of the ... city." A general plan "may be adopted in any format deemed appropriate or convenient by the legislative body, including the combining of elements." Such a plan is intended to "comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency." (Government Code sections 65300-65303.)

Good planning practice requires that General Plans be updated every ten years with State law requiring that the Housing Element be revised every five years. The 2001 General Plan for the Town of Loomis has been created as an update of the 1987 General Plan for the Town of Loomis. The goal was to clarify, update and codify existing planning and development policies and practices to insure that the intent of the Town are clear to both applicants and citizens.

The 2001 Loomis General Plan contains the State mandated elements and six optional elements combined into five elements: Community Development, Circulation, Housing, Public Facilities and Services, Conservation of Resources and Public Health and Safety.

Preparation of this General Plan has involved substantial study, public participation and environmental review. A 10 member General Plan Advisory Committee appointed by the Town Council on April 14, 1998 created the original draft plan. This Committee held 36 public meetings, including a town-wide workshop on June 6, 1998 and conducted a survey mailed to over 3400 property owners, renter, and business owners with a 22% response rate. In August 1998, the General Plan Update Technical Background Report was published. The Advisory Committee made their recommendation to the Planning Commission on January 6, 2000. Over 13 public hearings/meetings on the draft plan and draft Environmental Impact Report were held at the Planning Commission. The

Commission made their recommendation of the draft plan on April 24, 2000. The Draft General Plan Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report were mailed to State and local agencies and were available for public review between April 25, 2000 and June 12, 2000. The Town Council has considered the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and proposed 2001 General Plan at over 19 public meetings.

Section 2: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AND SIGNFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The EIR reviews the proposed General Plan and discusses the significant effects that could potentially occur. Some of these effects would become less than significant if the Town carries out specific proposed policies set forth in the General Plan and additional policies noted in the EIR and later included in the General Plan. Other environmental effects identified in the EIR will remain significant even if the Town carries out all of the proposed relevant General Plan policies.

In certifying this EIR and adopting the General Plan, the Town of Loomis is adopting all of the policies in the General Plan and noted as mitigation measures in the EIR as well as all of the proposed additional mitigation measures suggested in the EIR (and added as policies to the General Plan). By this adoption, and inclusion of the additional mitigation measures within the General Plan document itself, the Town is binding itself to implement these measures.

The EIR identified a number of potential environmental effects that might have been significant absent the protective general plan policies and implementation measures. For such effects, the EIR suggested no additional mitigation measures in the General Plan because the Town intends to adopt said protective policies and measures and the Town Council finds that once it has done so, the potentially adverse effects will be fully mitigated for the reasons stated in the following portions of the Final Environmental Impact Report (note that the proposed policies related to each are also referenced):

Aesthetics, pages 12-16 of FEIR, Policies LUE 1-6, Additional Policies AES 1,2
Cultural Resources, pages 39-41 of FEIR, Policies CR 1-3, Additional Policies CR 1,2
Geologic Processes, page 42-47 of FEIR, Policies PH&SE 2, 3, 6, 7; Implementation Measures PH&SE 2,3,5,6,10,11,12, and 21
Hazardous Materials (in town use and storage), pages 48-53, Policies PH&SE 3, 8, 11; Implementation Measure PH&SE!, 19, 20, 21, Additional Policy HM-1, 2
Hydrology (flooding and water quality; potentially water supply if facility expansions occur), pages 54-63, Policies PH&SE 3-5, Implementation Measures PH&SE 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 21; Additional Policies H-1 and -2.
Land Use, pages 64-69, Policies LUE D.1, D.3, E11, E (second residential units), F.9, G.1, G.2, G.5, G4 and Additional Policies LU-1,-2.
Public Services (parks, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries), pages 82-93. Policies LUE 1-6, 7-9, PS 1-6, CIRC 1-3, Implementation Measures LUE 1-3.
Transportation and Circulation (all issues not mentioned as significant following), pages 94-114 Policies CE-1 (Level of Service and Roadway Improvement), CE (Bicycle Facility)-1 and -2, CE (Transit Service) -1, -2, -3, -4, CE (Neighborhood

Environment) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, CE (Roadway System Funding) -1, -2, -3,-4, CE (Roadway Maintenance) -1, -2, -3 and Additional Policy CIRC-1.

Utilities (solid waste, wastewater, electricity, gas), pages 115-119, Policies PF 1, 2, 4, 5 and Additional Policies U-1-6.

After reviewing each General Plan element's proposed policies (de facto mitigation measures) and evaluating their effects the Town finds that all of those potentially significant effects will be mitigated to an acceptable level for the reasons stated in the above-referenced FEIR provisions. In addition, further regulatory protection provided by the state and federal government will provide additional protection for cultural resources, geologic processes, hazardous materials, hydrology, public services, transportation and utilities.

Section 3. FINDINGS OF SIGNFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS OF THE 2001 LOOMIS GENERAL PLAN

However, there are other significant and/or potentially significant environmental effects of the 2001 General Plan which are unavoidable, even with the proposed mitigation measures. Those effects involve environmental degradation with respect to the following: air quality, biological resources, hazardous materials (transportation), water supply, cumulative noise levels on major roadways, and cumulative roadway congestion, on selected roadways.

In order to approve a project that will have significant and unavoidable effects on the environment, a lead agency must adopt specified "findings" before it can approve such projects according to State law (Public Resources Code section 21081, CEQA Guidelines section 15091). For each significant effect, the agency must reach one or more of the following conclusions:

1. Changes or alterations have been required of, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR;

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding; such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or

3. Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

The "changes or alterations" to which the above findings refer are the "mitigation measures" or environmentally superior "alternatives" outlined in the project EIR. An EIR must contain, among other things, a discussion of the significant environmental effects that the project could cause; mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects; and alternatives to the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines section 15126).

After balancing, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of adopting the proposed 2001 General Plan, against the unavoidable environmental risks, the Town Council has determined that adoption of said update will have the following significant effects that cannot be reduced to an acceptable level:

AIR QUALITY: Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions which require contributing toward the attainment of State and Federal air quality standards, implementation of the 2001 General Plan will not reduce air quality to an acceptable level because the proposed mitigation measures contained in pages 22 and 23 of the EIR (including additional policies listed in the Air Quality section of the EIR, page 23) will not bring air quality into compliance with State and Federal standards. In addition, implementation of the mitigation measures will not sufficiently reduce the significant effects associated with individual development projects, and their contribution to the degradation of air quality. There are no feasible mitigation measures that can economically or practically reduce emissions of ozone precursors and PM10 to less-than-significant levels within the Town given the regional air quality. While the required mitigation measures will contribute positively to regional efforts to improve air quality, they will not reduce the adverse effects on air quality to an acceptable level. In fact, the Air Quality section concludes that the region is unlikely to reduce the number of ozone violations due to Placer County's rapid population growth, a minor portion of which includes the minimal growth proposed for Loomis. As set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit "B" to this Resolution, the Town Council concludes that the significant effects related to air quality are warranted by the benefits of adopting the 2001 General Plan with its proposed balanced growth of residential and commercial uses in promotion of a fiscally and environmentally sound community.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions which limit the impacts on riparian and biological resources, rare and endangered species, heritage trees and 100-year flood areas, all as described on pages 35-38 of the FEIR, implementation of the 2001 General Plan will nonetheless result in significant unavoidable impacts, which will be identified in future individual projects. Increased cumulative development throughout the region will also contribute to significant unavoidable impacts on biological resources. Therefore there will be significant unavoidable impacts in that these wetland habitats and their associated wildlife and special status species will be affected. The Town Council finds that these impacts on wetland areas are significant and unavoidable, because wetlands habitat and its special status species are unique, often supporting a wide variety of rare plant and wildlife species, and are diminishing in number. In addition, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit "B" to this Resolution, the Town Council concludes that the significant effects are rendered acceptable by the benefits of adopting the 2001 General Plan with its proposed balanced growth of residential and commercial uses in promotion of a fiscally and environmentally sound community.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (REGIONAL TRANSPORT OF MATERIALS) Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions which reduce the risks associated with hazardous materials, (see pages 51-52), implementation of the 2001 General Plan will nonetheless create a significant and unavoidable impact from the regional transporting of hazardous materials in that it will foster the continuing transportation of hazardous materials on I-80, Taylor Road and Sierra College, and there are no practical or economic mitigation measures that will reduce the environmental risks associated accidents involving the transportation of hazardous materials to acceptable levels. In addition, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit "B" to this Resolution, the Town Council concludes that the significant effects of transporting hazardous materials are warranted by the benefits of adopting the 2001 General Plan with its proposed balanced growth of residential and commercial uses in promotion of a fiscally and environmentally sound community.

WATER RESOURCE SUPPLY - Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions that support the anticipated water facility expansions (General Plan, page 108), such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Placer County Water Authority [PCWA], not within the jurisdiction of the Town of Loomis, in that PCWA rather than Loomis is charged with the authority and responsibility for expanding such facilities.

NOISE - Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions which require acoustical analysis and noise mitigation measures for new development, as well as additional policies that mitigate impacts related to noise, (see pages 76-81), implementation of the 2001 General Plan will nonetheless create a significant and unavoidable adverse noise impact since it is likely that noise increases associated with cumulative development will cause significant and unavoidable impacts which cannot be adequately mitigated in a practical and economic manner. The Loomis Basin is subject to substantial additional traffic from developments outside of Loomis which will affect the noise levels of several areas of town along Sierra College and I-80. Union Pacific Railroad has indicated that it will be increasing the number of train operations through town. Additionally, the placement of residential units near I-80 and the railroad tracks will create additional noise. In addition, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit "B" to this Resolution, the Town Council concludes that the significant effects of the cumulative noise impacts are warranted by the benefits of adopting the 2001 General Plan with its proposed balanced growth of residential and commercial uses in promotion of a fiscally and environmentally sound community.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION - Although the proposed General Plan Update contains tools, policies and actions which propose specific circulation/transportation/parking improvements and set a general Level of Service standard of "C" (pages 109-112), significant congestion on the major roadways (Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, Horseshoe Bar Road and King

Road) will nonetheless occur as a result of cumulative buildout in the Town, but mainly as a result of the buildout in jurisdictions adjacent to the Town whose residents will use these roads to reach I-80, schools and shopping. In addition, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit "B" to this Resolution, the Town Council concludes that the significant traffic effects are warranted by the benefits of adopting the 2001 General Plan with its proposed balanced growth of residential and commercial uses in promotion of a fiscally and environmentally sound community.

(2) FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives were selected for the environmental review of the proposed 2001 Loomis General Plan. Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) Town Council finds that the following specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the Final EIR for the following reason(s):

Alternative 1: No Project (Existing General Plan Buildout). CEQA requires an analysis of the no project alternative regardless of its environmental benefits or costs. This alternative would consider adopting no General Plan Update, but instead allowing buildout under the current General Plan. It would not include the new policies contained in the proposed update (which clarify, codify and update existing practices and policies), but instead would rely on the existing General Plan policies.

Finding: The Town Council of the Town of Loomis finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative for the following reasons:

- The project will provide many benefits, including environmentally sound land-use planning under a recently reviewed and adopted General Plan (as opposed to a General Plan adopted in 1987) with improved, standardized, and clarified policies resulting in environmental, economic, natural resource, conservation, and other benefits described in the statement of overriding considerations.
- This alternative would forgo the opportunity to provide for a business park area, to limit the impacts of new industrial use adjacent to existing residential, and to provide for approximately 180 acres of additional commercial/industrial land, thereby improving the town's sound fiscal base.
- With the additional industrial and commercial acreage, approximately 11,587 new jobs would be created.

Alternative 2: Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests. During the development of the currently proposed General Plan land use diagram, several land use changes were recommended by staff, but ultimately not adopted by the General Plan Steering Committee. In most cases, these changes were recommended to address one or more environmental issue, or to minimize potential land use conflicts at a given location. In addition, various citizens requested changes for their own purposes, which were not always environmental in nature. Collectively, these recommendations and requests form the basis of this project alternative. In summary, this alternative would include all the

land use designations shown for the proposed project along with staff recommendations and citizen requests. However, the policies would be similar to the project (clarifying, standardizing, codifying and updating the current General Plan policies and development review practices).

Finding: The Town Council of the Town of Loomis finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative for the following reasons:

- The project will provide many benefits, including environmentally sound land-use planning under a cohesive and socially acceptable plan adopted with substantial public participation with improved, standardized, and clarified policies resulting in environmental, economic, natural resource, conservation, and other benefits described in the statement of overriding considerations. This alternative, given that it consists of random requests from land owners, would not create a cohesive and socially acceptable plan.
- This alternative would include many citizen requests that could introduce impacts not anticipated under the proposed General Plan such as allowing the non-rural 10,000 square foot lots within 4.6 acre sites; increasing the traffic and driveways on rural roads; allowing additional commercial use on Sierra College Boulevard which is not considered appropriate for retention of the rural atmosphere of Loomis. This alternative is considered a generally environmentally inferior alternative.

Alternative 3: Staff Recommendations Only. This alternative is similar to the previous alternative in that it includes changes recommended by staff that generally coincide with changes that would mitigate one or more potential impacts, but different in the sense that it does not include specific changes requested by individual citizens. The changes recommended by staff would be included in combination with the changes suggested under the Proposed Project (See Table LU-1 in section 3.8 Land Use for a complete description of changes associated with the Proposed Project). As with the previous alternative, the policies included for the proposed project (clarifying, standardizing and codifying and updating the current General Plan policies and development review practices) would be the same under this alternative.

Finding: The Town Council of the Town of Loomis finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative for the following reasons:

- The project will provide many benefits, including environmentally sound land-use planning under a recently reviewed and cohesive General Plan adopted after substantial public participation which rejected the increased development intensity of this alternative, along Sierra College Boulevard, Rocklin and Barton Roads and adjacent to I-80 (Kim Property), providing a more rural atmosphere desired by the Town of Loomis.

Alternative 4: Maximum Development Scenario. After the initial opportunities for citizen input, a preliminary version of the updated General Plan was developed, which formed the basis of the Proposed Project. Alternatives 2 and 3 consider other changes that were ultimately not incorporated into the proposed General Plan update. Since that time, several other citizen requests have come forward that have not been previously

considered. This alternative considers these requests. Specifically, this alternative considers a "maximum buildout" scenario, which is a combination of the changes suggested under the proposed project, the original citizen requests and staff recommendation, and recently-suggested citizens requests. Again, the policies included with the proposed project would be the same under this alternative.

Finding: The Town Council of the Town of Loomis finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative for the following reasons:

- The project will provide many benefits, including environmentally sound land-use planning under a cohesive and socially acceptable plan adopted with substantial public participation with improved, standardized, and clarified policies resulting in environmental, economic, natural resource, conservation, and other benefits described in the statement of overriding considerations. This alternative, given that it consists of all of the random requests from land owners, would not create a cohesive and socially acceptable plan.

- This alternative would include even more citizen requests than Alternative 2 that could introduce impacts not anticipated under the proposed General Plan such as the non-rural 10,000 square foot lots within 4.6 acre sites; increasing the traffic and driveways on rural roads; allowing additional commercial use on Sierra College Boulevard which is not considered appropriate for retention of the rural atmosphere of Loomis. It is considered the most environmentally inferior alternative. Impacts to traffic and aesthetics in particular would be substantially worse, as would land use conflicts in many areas

The Town Council rejects these alternatives on environmental and social grounds, after numerous public hearings on the proposals.

Section 4. MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

As required by State law, the Town, in adopting these findings, also adopts a mitigation monitoring plan designed to ensure that, during project implementation, the Town, affected landowners, their assigns and successors in interest, and any other responsible parties comply with the feasible mitigation measures identified in the final EIR and incorporated herein.

EXHIBIT "B"

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDRATION

The Town Council of the Town of Loomis adopts and makes this statement of overriding considerations concerning the 2001 General Plan's unavoidable significant impacts to explain why the project's benefits override and outweigh its unavoidable impacts. Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the project, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact. The following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of adopting the proposed General Plan Update, outweigh the significant effects identified in Exhibit "A", Section 3, for the following reasons:

1. The Town has not reviewed its General Plan since 1987, and has held numerous public hearings on the proposed 2001 General Plan in order to best determine the policies and land use diagram for build out of the town. The proposed plan is that balance which best meets the needs of the residents of Loomis and the region. The plan updates, clarifies, codifies and standardizes the current general plan goals and policies and development review practices to provide better direction to applicants, staff and citizens regarding the desires of the Town and is designed to improve the quality of life and protect the Town's natural resources.

2. The project will provide an environmentally sound updated General Plan with improved, standardized, and clarified environmental, economic, natural resource, conservation policies to ensure the best balanced maintenance of the environment within the Town of Loomis.

3. The project will provide a sound updated General Plan with improved, standardized, and clarified safety policies regarding building within floodplains and storage of hazardous materials to ensure a safer environment within the Town of Loomis.

4. The project will assist in the creation of new jobs (direct and indirect) and increased local tax revenues, thereby improving the Town's fiscal base by increasing the industrial and commercial acreage by 180 acres. This includes 1) addition of the Business Park use as a new land use, and designation of 40 acres for this use, with substantial buffering from surrounding uses and 2) addition of the Tourist Destination use as a new land use, and designation of 113 acres for this use.

5. The improvements that comprise the Project will accommodate development under the General Plan with an efficient and well-functioning circulation system. By decreasing congestion, the Project will contribute in a positive way to attainment of air quality standards over what would occur without the Project. The Project will also facilitate development under the General Plan.

6. The proposed development is balanced to generate funds to provide the needed road improvements, signalization, drainage improvements, and other public facilities

and capital equipment. The project will also encourage new commercial development, thereby generating additional revenues to the Town and region.

7. Development under the General Plan will provide additional needed housing to meet the demands of the growing population of the South Placer Region, particularly allowing for additional "move-up" housing within Loomis and additional policies allowing second units.

8. Inclusion of policies maximizing opportunities for preservation and maintenance of open space resources and valuable habitat areas by preserving riparian corridors and floodplains.

9. Inclusion of design and economic element policies to give better direction to applicants and better information to the town when approving new development projects.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is a program environmental impact report (EIR) that examines the environmental effects of the proposed update of the Town of Loomis General Plan. The document has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. According to Section 15168(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a program EIR should be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project. A general plan update is the type of project for which the use of program EIRs is specifically intended.

In any general plan, the Land Use Element guides the magnitude and location of future development. As a rule, impacts stemming from the implementation of a general plan arise from development envisioned by the Land Use Element. All other elements are by their nature intended to address and mitigate these impacts, whether through the construction of new roads (Circulation Element), noise barriers (Public Health and Safety Element) or the protection of natural resources (Conservation of Resources Element). Therefore, rather than creating environmental impacts, the other General Plan elements primarily serve to alleviate potential environmental impacts.

The Land Use Element, on the other hand, has a somewhat different role in that it specifically allows for development within the Town's planning area. Consequently, unlike the other General Plan elements, it facilitates development rather than placing restrictions on development to minimize environmental or other effects. The effects of buildout under the Land Use Element are therefore analyzed in greater detail in this EIR, with specific references to the various implementing goals and policies that pertain to that impact. In summary, this EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed Land Use Element, the potential for this and the other elements to mitigate these impacts, and proposes additional mitigation measures in the form of policies, roadways, or land use distributions.

1.1 PURPOSE/LEGAL AUTHORITY

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* (California Administrative Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3), the purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that:

> *will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.*

This EIR fulfills the requirements for a Program EIR. As provided in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project. The use of a Program EIR can allow a Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early time when an agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts. A specific format for a program EIR is not specified in the CEQA Guidelines. Instead, there is flexibility allowed in its presentation.

A Program EIR is not intended or required to provide project-level mitigation where impacts are identified. The preparation of a Program EIR does not eliminate the need for environmental review for individual development projects that may be contemplated under the General Plan Update. Instead, it is intended to identify general impacts that may be likely to occur, noting general locations or conditions in the community where such impacts could happen. The purpose of the program EIR approach is to lay the groundwork for determining what level of additional environmental review would be needed for individual development projects.

A program EIR is by its nature general in approach. Future development projects in the community are generally not well understood at the time a program EIR is prepared. Consequently, the analysis must also be general, as must the mitigation measures, which in this case would be framed as General Plan policies. Under CEQA, a program EIR cannot be as specific as a project EIR (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15146(b)), nor can it speculate on impacts that cannot be reasonably anticipated (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15145).

1.2 SCOPE AND CONTENT

In accordance with the provisions of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the Town of Loomis Planning Department prepared an Initial Study on the proposed project. The Initial Study, contained in this Draft EIR as Appendix A, determined that the proposed project could result in significant adverse effects on the environment and, therefore, an EIR is required.

The Initial Study was circulated with a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR in January 2000. Responses to the NOP are contained in Appendix A. The following issues were identified by the Initial Study as having potentially significant impacts.

- *Aesthetics*
- *Air Quality*
- *Biological Resources*
- *Cultural Resources*
- *Geological Processes*
- *Hazardous Materials*
- *Hydrology*
- *Land Use*
- *Noise*
- *Public Services*
- *Transportation and Circulation*
- *Utilities*

This EIR evaluates potential impacts in each of these areas. It addresses both site-specific and cumulative impacts of the proposed project in accordance with the provisions set forth in the *State CEQA Guidelines*. (It should be noted that because the project includes development of an entire General Plan, project impacts are equivalent to cumulative impacts.) The focus of this EIR is to address potentially significant environmental issues identified in the Town's Initial Study and to recommend feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts. A discussion of potential growth-inducing impacts of the project is also provided, as required by CEQA.

The alternatives section of this EIR has been prepared in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. The alternative analysis examines a range of reasonable alternative uses that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the proposed project and are capable of eliminating or reducing some of the significant adverse environmental effects associated with the project.

1.3 LEAD AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

The Town of Loomis is considered the lead agency in preparing this EIR and will be responsible for the approvals that would allow the development.

Section 15381 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* defines a "responsible agency" as:

> *a public agency which proposes to carry out or approve a project, for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration." For purposes of CEQA, responsible agencies include all public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval authority over the project.*

Some proposed transportation improvements require the cooperation of several other agencies. These include the Union Pacific Railroad, Placer County, the City of Rocklin and Caltrans. However, they do not have discretionary approval over the adoption of the General Plan Update. Consequently, they are not considered responsible agencies per the *CEQA Guidelines*.

1.4 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR is intended to be used as an informational source that provides full disclosure of the environmental consequences associated with the discretionary actions required to implement the General Plan Update. This EIR will be used by the Town of Loomis, other reviewing agencies and the general public in their review of the proposed project.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is an update of the Town of Loomis' General Plan, first adopted in 1987. Loomis is located in Placer County, midway between the cities of Roseville and Auburn, northeast of Sacramento (Figure 1). This General Plan Update responds to changes in the community and surrounding areas since it was incorporated in 1984, and in the years since the adoption of the first General Plan. The Community Development Element addresses the community's vision for development during the planning horizon, identified as the year 2020. It includes a map of proposed urban boundaries and planned land uses. It also contains goals, objectives and policies that will govern the growth of the Town of Loomis and the management of its resources. The updated General Plan also includes five other elements: Public Services Facilities & Finances, Circulation, Conservation of Resources, Public Health & Safety, and Housing. As required under state law, these elements address the seven mandated General Plan issues (Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, and Housing).

The magnitude of buildout under the updated General Plan would be the result of two factors:

1) development of vacant lands within the Town; and 2) the redesignation of some lands within the Town to accommodate development different than what is anticipated in the previous general plan. At this time, an expansion of the Town's existing Sphere of Influence is not anticipated. (The Town's existing boundaries are the same as its Sphere of Influence.)

Under the proposed General Plan Update, the ultimate buildout population could be as much as 10,400, a 70% increase over the existing population of 6,100. About 480,000 square feet of new commercial development and 800,000 square feet of new industrial development would likely occur under the General Plan Update by 2020. New non-residential development would likely accommodate up to about 2,400 new jobs by 2020, for a total of 4,021. However, the rate of job production would be based on economic and market conditions, which fluctuate greatly over time. Full buildout under the General Plan Update, based on the holding capacity of the vacant lands in the Town, could accommodate a total employment of about 13,137. This accounts for the full holding capacity of all vacant non-residential land.

2.1 REDESIGNATION of LAND WITHIN THE TOWN

In general, most of the Town would retain its existing land use designations (Figure 2). However, there would be several areas, particularly undeveloped areas, where substantial land use designation changes are contemplated (Figure 3). To summarize, **increased residential density** is contemplated at the following locations:

- *Along Bankhead Road, between Sierra College Blvd. and the Town boundary; and*
- *Northwest of the intersection of Barton and Rocklin roads*

In addition, the subdivision on Mareta Road will be redesignated to a higher density, to reflect the density of development that already exists at this location.

Changes from **residential** to **commercial** designations are proposed at the following locations:

- *South side of Taylor Road, northeast of Sierra College Blvd.;*
- *Sierra College Blvd., from Taylor Road to Bankhead Road;*
- *NW corner of King Road and I-80 (residential to office);*
- *West of rail line and adjacent to Swetzer Road extension (residential to business park);*
- *Various parcels between Secret Ravine and Interstate 80 at Horseshoe Bar Road totaling 117 acres (residential to tourist/destination commercial)*

The following areas would undergo **modifications to existing commercial** designations:

- *SE corner of Brace Road and Sierra College Blvd. (Shopping Center to Gen. Comm.);*
- *South side of King Road at I-80 (Neighborhood Comm. To General Comm.);*
- *North side of Raley's center (Planned Development to General Commercial); and*
- *South side of King Road west of Rippy Road (Gen. Comm. To Office Professional)*

Figure 1. Location Map
(same as Figure 1 in Initial Study)

Figure 2. Land Use Diagram
(same as CMCM colored map)

Figure 3. Areas of Change
(same as CMCM colored map)

In addition to these changes, a new Limited Industrial designation has been included in the General Plan Update, and the property on the east side of Swetzer Road north of King Road would be changed from Light Industry to Limited Industrial.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed land uses designations by acreage. Please refer to the draft General Plan Update for more details.

Table 1. Summary of Proposed Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Acreage	Change from Existing Plan
Residential Designations:		
Residential High Density (10-15 du/ac)	1.4	-
Residential Medium Density (6-10 du/ac)	96.4	**+2.2**
Residential Medium Density (2-6 du/ac)	99.8	-10.8
Residential Medium Density (6 du/ac)	9.2	-0.3
Residential Low Density (0.5 du/ac)	32.1	**+19.7**
Residential Low Density (1 du/ac)	277.9	-20.6
Residential Estate (0.22-0.43 du/ac)	475.7	-22.6
Residential Rural Agricultural (up to 0.22 du/ac)	2,498.7	-177.6
Subtotal All Residential:	*3,698.6*	*-209.3*
Commercial Designations:		
General Commercial	191.9	**+33.9**
General Commercial – Downtown Core	39.0	**+0.4**
General Commercial – Tourist/Destination	117.4	**+117.4 (new designation)**
General Commercial – Office	28.9	**+13.3**
Subtotal All Commercial:	*377.2*	*+165.0*
Industrial Designations:		
Industrial – Business Park	35.3	-110.9
Industrial – Limited Industry	36.0	**+36.0 (new designation)**
Industrial – Light Industry	110.2	**+110.2 (new designation)**
Subtotal All Industrial:	*181.5*	*+35.3*
Public/Quasi-Public	*80.9*	*+8.9*
TOTAL	**4,338.3**	**-**

2.2 BUILDOUT POTENTIAL

The proposed General Plan Update describes buildout potential of the community. Table 2 summarizes development potential upon full buildout of the General Plan Update. Buildout envisions a 78% increase in commercially-designated land (an increase of 165 acres), and a 24% increase in industrially-designated area (35 more acres, all for business park uses). Residentially-designated land would decrease by about 5% (209 acres).

The type and amount of development that actually occurs will depend on market forces. The total industrial, commercial and residential buildout may not occur within the 2020 horizon of

the General Plan Update. However, for the purpose of this EIR, impacts are based on full buildout regardless of timing, in order to evaluate all potential impacts associated with development.

Population and Housing. The General Plan Update would accommodate as many as 3,851 dwelling units, a 73% increase over the existing number of homes (2,220). The population could increase from 6,100 to as much as 10,400, a 70% rise. The economic analysis prepared for this General Plan Update estimates that much of this buildout would likely occur within the 2020 planning horizon for the plan (Taussig & Associates, 1999).

Non-Residential Square Footage and Employment. There are currently about 1,550 job opportunities within the Town (Taussig & Associates, 1999), which equates to an estimated 800,000 square feet of developed commercial and industrial area (Table 2). Under the draft General Plan Update, about 558 acres would be designated for commercial or industrial use. About 66 are already developed for this purpose. The Taussig study estimates that only about 105 of the remaining available non-residential acres (about 21% of the remaining total) would be developed by 2020. Based on anticipated market conditions, this area would support about 2,471 new job opportunities, for a total of 4,021 jobs in the Town. This translates to about new 800,000 square feet of industrial uses, and 480,000 square feet of commercial development during the 20-year horizon of the General Plan Update.

Table 2. Maximum Buildout Potential Under the Draft General Plan Update

Land Use Type	Existing Uses (2000)	Additional Development Likely by 2020[c]	Total New Development Potential[b]	Maximum Buildout[b]
Residential (units)				
Single Family	2,100	1,489	1,489	3,589
Multi-Family	120	142	142	262
Total	**2,220[a]**	**1,631**	**1,631**	**3,851**
Non-Residential (square feet)				
Commercial	300,000	480,000	3,800,000	4,100,000
Industrial	500,000	800,000	1,900,000	2,400,000
Total	**800,000**	**1,280,000**	**5,700,000**	**6,500,000**
Employment[d]				
Commercial	690	1,100	8,735	9,425
Industrial	860	1,371	2,852	3,712
Total	**1,550**	**2,471**	**11,587**	**13,137**

[a] From Department of Finance, 1999. Mobile homes are included under "single-family"
[b] Based upon currently vacant land in the Town, at maximum holding capacity. Assumes 25% of all homes in RMH (6-10du/ac) designation would be multi-family. Comm. SF is based on 0.25 FAR; Ind. SF is based on 0.30 FAR. Existing Comm. and Ind. SF based on employment per acre information from Taussig. Buildout based on 182 ac Ind, 377 ac Comm, using assumptions described above
[c] Based upon absorption rates estimated in the Taussig study (1999).
[c] Existing employment by land use type derived from Taussig study total, disaggregated by existing developed acres and 0.25 FAR (Comm) and 0.30 FAR (Ind)

Although this is the estimated non-residential development that is likely to occur by 2020, an EIR must base its potential impacts on full buildout under the General Plan Update, regardless of the timing of that development. At full buildout under the General Plan Update, an estimated 4.1 million square feet of commercial uses and 2.4 million square feet of industrial uses could be accommodated in the 558 acres to be designated for these uses. This land could

theoretically support an estimated 13,137 jobs, many more than could be absorbed by residents of Loomis.

Section 15130 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that EIRs address cumulative impacts using either a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects or a summary of projections contained in a general plan or related planning document. Because the proposed project is a General Plan Update, impacts associated with buildout under the proposed General Plan Update represent the cumulative scenario. In the traffic analysis, the effects of regional development are used to help determine cumulative impacts. Subsequent environmental review would be required for individual development projects contemplated under the General Plan, which would provide additional detail regarding site-specific and cumulative impacts.

2.3 OTHER PHYSICAL CHANGES UNDER THE GENERAL PLAN

The General Plan Update includes several modifications to the Town's existing circulation system in order to accommodate potential growth. For the purpose of this EIR analysis, the following circulation changes would be anticipated under the proposed General Plan Update:

- Widen Sierra College Boulevard to 6 lanes north of I-80 (to Bankhead);
- Reconstruct the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard interchange (City of Rocklin improvement);
- Widen I-80 from a 6-lane to an 8-lane freeway east and west of Horseshoe Bar Road;
- Install bike lanes on Taylor Road from Midas Avenue (in Rocklin) to Sierra College Boulevard, and from King Road to the Loomis Town Limits; and
- Provide passenger rail service to Loomis.

Note that most of these improvements will depend on the cooperation of outside agencies, including the City of Rocklin, Caltrans, AMTRAK, and the Union Pacific Railroad. The following Town-specific roadway modifications are anticipated under the updated Circulation Element, and are intended to respond to future development or specific concerns raised during the General Plan Update preparation process:

- Swetzer Road extension (from King Road to Sierra College Boulevard);
- Boyington Road extension (freeway frontage road from King Road to Horseshoe Bar Road);
- Various functional improvements to Taylor Road in the downtown core;
- Widen Sierra College Boulevard to 4 lanes north of Bankhead;
- Widen Horseshoe Bar Road to 4 lanes, from Boyington Road extension (near I-80) to the southern boundary of the commercial property south of I-80; and
- Widen Rocklin Road to 4 lanes from near Sierra College Boulevard to Barton Road.

With the exception of the last improvement, all are located entirely within Loomis. The widening of Rocklin Road to Sierra College Boulevard would require the cooperation other agencies through which the roadway extends beyond the Loomis town limit.

2.4 PROPOSED PROJECT GOALS and OBJECTIVES

By its nature, the General Plan Update is a document based on goals and objectives. Each element contains a hierarchy of goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures, which are used to guide future development in the community. The statements, particularly the policies and implementation measures, also function as mitigation measures in the context of this EIR. All draft General Plan Update goals and objectives are incorporated by reference, with policies and implementation measures referred to within the impact analysis where appropriate.

3.0 IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section evaluates impacts with respect to the issue areas identified in the Initial Study for this project as needing further consideration. Issues are presented in the same order as described in the Initial Study. Those issues found to be less than significant in the Initial Study are not analyzed in this EIR.

Because the project is a General Plan Update, identified impacts are very general in nature, and in many cases highly subjective. The purpose in identifying potential impact is to propose mitigation that could address known issues in the community that are not already addressed in the draft General Plan Update. Mitigation measures follow one of two types: 1) new or revised policy language, to be added to the plan; or 2) suggested land use designation changes for specific areas, to address potential impacts related to the proximity of various land uses. As a program EIR for an entire community, it is not appropriate to suggest mitigation measures that are too restrictive, or very specific to certain parcels. The Town has other implementation mechanisms, including the zoning ordinance, zoning map, specific plans, and subdivision ordinance, where detailed standards for certain areas may be appropriately applied.

3.1 AESTHETICS (Visual Resources; Light and Glare)

Setting

The Draft Land Use and Community Development Element contains a section describing the visual character of the community. This information is also contained in the Technical Background Report for the General Plan Update.

Visual Character of the Community. The Town of Loomis includes a variety of visually pleasing landscapes. Despite continuing growth, the wooded hills, grasslands, and agricultural areas surrounding the more urbanized core still retain a predominantly open, rural feeling. Loomis is still viewed as a pleasant small town, with commercial areas of pedestrian scale, and an historic architectural heritage.

The Town's visual character is widely appreciated by residents and visitors, and its importance has been highlighted elsewhere in this General Plan Update as a result of community preferences expressed throughout the process of General Plan Update preparation. However, recent growth and development have raised more community design issues than ever before, in part because of the significant growth pressures facing the region, and the type of development projects that have been proposed in the Town.

Even though court decisions on the rights of communities to manage the planning and appearance of development have found that aesthetic regulation is appropriate, the adoption of design standards may be controversial. Aesthetics are inherently subjective.

Sensitive Viewing Corridors. Several major roadways also function as sensitive viewing corridors. Although not particularly scenic, the view from I-80 is the primary impression that travelers receive while passing through the Town, and is designated as a scenic corridor by the County. Other important viewing corridors include Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and

Horseshoe Bar Road. Horseshoe Bar Road and portions of Sierra College Boulevard traverse areas that still maintain a highly rural character. The two rail corridors also may be considered view corridors for passengers passing through on AMTRAK trains.

Light and Glare. Typical sources of light and glare include street lights, lighted parking lots, and lighted signs next to commercial structures. The football stadium at Del Oro High School is another primary source of light while games are in progress. At this time, no existing sources within Loomis are perceived as a substantial nuisance or safety hazard to nearby residents or motorists. See the Draft Land Use and Community Development Element for more information regarding this topic.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Thresholds of Significance. An impact is considered significant if the assessment of aesthetic impacts involves qualitative analysis that is inherently subjective in nature. Different viewers react to viewsheds and aesthetic conditions differently. An impact is considered significant if buildout under the proposed General Plan Update would result in one or more of the following conditions:

- *Proposed development would adversely affect a viewshed from a sensitive public viewing area (roadways and public parks);*
- *New light and glare sources are introduced that substantially alter the nighttime lighting of the planning area;*
- *An existing identified visual resource is adversely altered or obstructed by potential development; or*
- *Development conflicts with visual resource guidelines in adopted Town and County documents*

Key Issues. The following key environmental issues related to visual resources were identified during the preparation of the proposed General Plan. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan.

- *The Town of Loomis would like to retain the character of a friendly small town in a rural setting. The growth pressures of the Sacramento region and the ongoing suburbanization in surrounding communities threaten this character.*

- *Identifying ways to preserve open space areas and views is important in retaining the community's rural atmosphere.*

- *The character of recent non-residential development in Loomis has tended toward generic suburban architectural styles. Some residents feel that existing development regulations and design guidelines are not creating and maintaining the desired rural and historical community character.*

- *Some gateway areas to the Town contain land uses, the visual character of which could be improved on currently vacant sites. The Town would like its gateway areas to reflect its distinct, rural character.*

- *The downtown core has a generally consistent design theme, but a number of the buildings have undesirable facade and design elements.*

- *Residents of Loomis would like to accelerate the redevelopment of the downtown.*

- *New land uses will need high quality design to be acceptable to the community.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issues identified, the following are considered potentially significant land use impacts by the community:

- Potential urbanization of the community from growth pressures;
- Potential for proposed commercial development to appear generic;
- Degradation of public viewsheds;
- Potential urban design concerns for the downtown area and new commercial development;
- Concerns over gateway treatments at the edge of the community.

Sensitive Viewing Corridors. Buildout under the General Plan Update would accommodate new development, some of which would be near highly sensitive viewing corridors. Development within these areas could therefore result in visual impacts. Commercial development near Horseshoe Bar Road would be very near I-80, a highly traveled corridor from which many people base their impressions of the community. The sign for the Raley's Center is an example of the type of intrusive visual impact that could result along this corridor. Similar impacts could also occur along Sierra College Boulevard, where additional commercial development is slated.

Urban Design. In the absence of appropriate urban design criteria, development that could be accommodated under the Draft Land Use and Community Design Element has the potential to be insensitive to the need for high quality architectural design, and landscaping. It could also result in visually intrusive features, such as inappropriate signs.

Community Character. New development that could be accommodated under the Draft Land Use Element would incrementally alter the small town character of the Town to a more urban environment. However, most of the new development anticipated under the element would be infill of areas within the current Town limits and adjacent to existing developed areas. Rural residential uses, for example, are proposed adjacent to similar development. In such cases, development would not fundamentally alter the small town character of the Town.

Light and Glare. Buildout under the Draft Land Use Element would increase nighttime ambient lighting and daytime glare potential throughout the Town. Increased lighting could come from streetlights, parking lot lights, and signs on and at building establishments. Increased glare could come from building materials, roofing materials and windows reflecting sunlight.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The proposed General Plan Update includes goals and policies intended to conserve and preserve the Town's scenic resources. Additionally, the plan includes goals and policies that prevent incompatible and intrusive uses.

The following Draft Land Use and Community Design Element policies address potential impacts related to the key issues described above:

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 1.** The design of development should respect the key natural and built resources on each site, including ecological systems, vegetative communities, major trees, water courses, land forms, archaeological resources, and historically and architecturally important structures. Proposed project designs should identify and conserve special areas of high ecological sensitivity throughout the Town. Examples of resources to preserve include riparian corridors, oak woodlands, and estuaries.

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 2.** Each development project should be designed to be consistent with the unique local context of Loomis (addresses form, siting, massing, natural features and surroundings).

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 3.** Design each project at a human scale consistent with surrounding natural and built features.

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 4.** Design projects to minimize the need to use automobiles for transportation.

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 5.** Encourage an active, varied, and concentrated urban life within commercial areas (encourages pedestrian-oriented development and mixed uses).

- **Policy LUE (Community Design) 6.** Respect and preserve natural resources within rural areas (through the harmonious design of buildings, and the emphasis on native vegetation and natural forms in landscaping)

In addition, the General Plan Update includes an implementation measure that calls for "*the preparation of detailed and design guidelines for multi-family residential, commercial, and industrial and other nonresidential development types, to expand on the general policies provided above, and provide developers with clear expressions of community preferences for project design, without mandating single architectural styles.*"

Implementation of these policies is anticipated to mitigate impacts relating to visual character of the community. However, no Draft General Plan policies directly address issues related to minimizing light and glare impacts. Several policies within the Draft General Plan Update encourage site planning techniques that would indirectly minimize the potential for light and glare impacts. Such methods include setbacks, building orientation, and separation of incompatible land uses. The Draft Community Design Element also encourages the use of street trees and non-reflective building materials, both of which would reduce glare impacts. In order to ensure that such impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level, the following policy/implementation measures shall be added to the Draft Land Use and Community Design Element:

- **Additional Policy AES-1.** New lighting (including lighted signage) that is part of residential, commercial, industrial or recreational development shall be oriented away from sensitive uses, and shielded to the extent possible to minimize spillover light and glare. Lighting plans shall be required for all proposed commercial and industrial development prior to issuance of building permits.

- **Additional Policy AES-2.** New lighted park and recreation facilities shall undergo review to determine whether lighting would impact adjacent residential uses. If such impacts would occur, facilities shall remain either unlighted, or lighting shall be limited either by timing or location, as appropriate.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of the proposed policies of the Land Use and Community Design Element, in combination with the additional recommended policies, would be expected to mitigate impacts to view corridors. No significant impacts are anticipated.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

Setting

The following is a general discussion of the regional air quality characteristics of the Loomis planning area, with a background discussion of the climate of the area. Please refer to the Technical Background report for the General Plan Update for additional discussion.

Climate and Meteorology. The Loomis planning area is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which is characterized by cool winters and hot, dry summers tempered by occasional westerly breezes from the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. Weather in summer, spring, and fall is generally a result of the movement and intensity of the semi-permanent high pressure area located in the Pacific Ocean several hundred miles to the west. Winter weather is generally a function of the size and location of low pressure weather systems originating in the north Pacific Ocean.

The nearest climatic data station to the area is the Auburn weather station. The average daily maximum temperature recorded at this station is 72.6 degrees for the period of 1951 to 1980 (NOAA, 1982). The hottest months are July and August, with average maximum daily temperatures of 93.4 and 92.0, respectively. The coolest month is January, with an average daily minimum temperature of 35.9 degrees. The average annual precipitation recorded at the Auburn station for the same period is 34.46 inches. Approximately 88 percent of this precipitation occurs between November and April.

Air pollution problems often develop when calm winds combine with a strong inversion layer (that is, relatively warm air overlying cooler air). Calm conditions are experienced about 9% of the time within the air basin, most often in the wintertime. On the other hand, spring and especially summer are marked by strong sea breezes. High temperatures in the valley often create localized low pressure, which induces the "Delta" breezes through the gap at the Carquinez Strait, a natural cooling phenomenon. These sea breezes tend to disperse air pollutants and may prevent high ozone concentrations during the summer when high temperatures are likely to accelerate ozone formation. Table AQ-1 presents the percentage of occurrence of these airflow patterns.

Table AQ-1. Sacramento Valley Airflow Patterns (%)

Pattern	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	Year
Full Sea Breeze	9	29	55	22	29
Calm	18	5	3	12	9
Other	73	66	42	56	62

Source: Town of Loomis, *Sherwood Park Draft EIR*, 1998

The topography of the planning area is such that frequent temperature inversions are not expected. However, meteorological conditions may occur such that the entire Sacramento Valley experiences a temperature inversion, facilitating the accumulation of ozone precursors and ozone formation.

Pollutants of Concern. There are many pollutants present in the atmosphere. However, most are not a significant public health concern in the planning area. In the Sacramento region,

carbon monoxide and ozone are of particular concern. Pollutants of concern in the planning area are summarized below.

Particulate Matter (PM_{10}). Particulate matter refers to solid matter and fine droplets (aerosols) suspended in the atmosphere. Ambient air quality standards for particulate matter have historically been based on particulates equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter, called PM_{10}. The USEPA also recently adopted a standard for 2.5 micron particulates ($PM_{2.5}$) in addition to the standard for PM_{10}. Particulates, as opposed to dust, cannot be adequately filtered by the human respiratory system and is considered inhalable. Inhaled atmospheric particulates can be harmful to humans by directly causing injuries to the respiratory tract and lungs or by the reactive gases which were absorbed by the inhaled particulate. Suspended particulates scatter and absorb sunlight, producing haze and reducing visibility.

Nitrogen Oxide (NO_X). Oxides of nitrogen (NO and NO_2) and reactive organic compounds (ROC) participate in photochemical reactions that produce smog. These chemicals are considered to be precursors of ozone, as their reaction leads to its formation. High temperatures associated with internal combustion engines and industrial operations cause the formation of NO_X by combining atmospheric nitrogen and oxygen.

Ozone. Ozone is the most common component of smog and is the principal pollutant that causes adverse health effects. Ozone is toxic and colorless, and has a pungent odor. In high concentrations, ozone and other photochemical oxidants are directly detrimental to humans by causing respiratory irritation and possible alterations in the functioning of the lungs. Oxidants also inhibit vegetation growth.

Carbon Monoxide. Carbon monoxide is a primary pollutant emitted directly from combustion sources, principally automobile engines, and may cause localized problems associated with congested vehicle traffic.

Ambient Regional Air Quality. Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board (ARB) have established air quality standards, based on consideration of the health and welfare of the general public. The National Ambient Air Quality standards (NAAQS) and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) are summarized in Table AQ-2. State standards are more stringent than the Federal standards; therefore, when Federal air pollutant standards are exceeded, the State standards are also exceeded.

Air Quality Attainment Status. The Federal and California Clean Air Acts require identification and classification of each state air basin as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified based on the NAAQS and CAAQS. An attainment designation for a particular pollutant indicates that available ambient monitoring data have shown that the NAAQS or CAAQS for that pollutant have not been violated (or exceeded). A nonattainment designation for a given pollutant indicates that the standards have been exceeded for that pollutant. An unclassified designation indicates that insufficient ambient monitoring data are available to determine whether or not there have been violations of the NAAQS or CAAQS for the pollutant in question. For regulatory purposes, an unclassified area is generally treated the same as an attainment area.

Table AQ-2. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	Federal Standard
Ozone	1-Hour	0.09 ppm	0.12 ppm
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1-Hour 8-Hour	20 ppm 9.0 ppm	35 ppm 9.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	1-Hour Annual	0.25 ppm ---	--- 0.053 ppm
Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	24-Hour Annual Geometric Mean Annual Arithmetic Mean	50 ug/m3 30 ug/m3 ---	150 ug/m3 --- 50 ug/m3
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	24-Hour	0.04 ppm	0.14 ppm

The planning area is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Table AQ-3 provides the attainment status for each pollutant in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The planning area is in non-attainment for ozone based on both state and federal standards. For PM_{10}, it is in nonattainment for the state standard only. The planning area is in attainment for all other pollutants.

Table AQ-3. Attainment Status Of The Sacramento Valley Air Basin

Pollutant	Federal Status	State Status
Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
CO	Nonattainment (Sacramento Urbanized Area only)	Unclassified
PM_{10}	Attainment	Nonattainment
NO_2	Attainment	Attainment
SO_2	Attainment	Attainment

Odors. No single source of odors can be identified in the planning area. However, the Loomis area supports substantial agricultural uses, often in close proximity to residences and other odor-sensitive land uses. Typical odors from such uses include manure from livestock and fertilizer for crop production, which are often perceived as objectionable. Consequently, while odors are not an acute problem within the planning area, they may be considered substantial for some area residents.

Regulatory Framework. Air pollution control is administered on three government levels in the State of California: Federal (EPA), State (ARB) and local (Placer County Air Pollution Control District [APCD]). The Placer County APCD administers air pollution control programs in Placer County in consultation with the EPA and ARB.

Federal. Under federal law, a large region called the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area, which includes Loomis as part of multi-county area (Sacramento, and parts of Placer, Yolo and Solano), has received a severe non-attainment designation for the federal ozone standard. Accordingly, these areas must work together to resolve issues related to ozone emissions.

The Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (1994) identifies sources controls and trip reduction strategies aimed at achieving the federal ozone standard by 2005. The attainment strategy requires reductions of about 38% of ROG and 40% of NOx from 1990 baseline conditions. Failure to achieve this may result in funding and regulatory sanctions imposed by the federal government.

Amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act required each Air Pollution Control District to submit an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for approval by ARB and the EPA. The goal of the AQMP was to reduce pollutant concentrations below the Federal standards. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments prepared an AQMP in 1982. That AQMP was based upon transportation control measures and land use measures that were not adopted by local planning authorities. On December 1, 1988, the EPA formally disapproved the 1982 AQMP based upon the inability to meet Federal ozone standards. As a result of formal disapproval of local efforts to attain Federal air quality standards, the EPA prepared a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for the southern Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The FIP was finalized on February 14, 1995. The purpose of the FIP was to provide control measures to reduce emissions with the goal that the Sacramento Valley Air Basin will attain the Federal ozone standard by 2005. However, on April 11, 1995, President Clinton signed into law HR 889, a Department of Defense appropriations bill that contained provisions rescinding the FIP. As a consequence, the area is subject to the provisions of the Placer County 1992 Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Clean Air Act.

State. Assembly Bill 2595 (known as the California Clean Air Act) took effect on January 1, 1989. The goal of this bill is to attain the CAAQS by the earliest practicable date. The 1992 Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) was prepared by the Placer County APCD to meet the requirements of the California Clean Air Act. The AQAP included stationary source, mobile source and indirect source control measures to reduce emissions to the extent feasible. The control measures identified in the AQAP are intended to reduce emissions to the extent feasible and enable progress towards attainment of the State ozone standard. These measures include:

- *Areawide carpool and vanpools;*
- *Trip reduction ordinances;*
- *Support for bicycle and pedestrian transportation systems;*
- *Use of alternative motor fuels;*
- *Jobs-housing balance in new developments;*
- *Mixed land uses;*
- *Transit service expansion;*
- *Parking space limitations; and*
- *Park-and ride lots on the suburban fringe*

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Thresholds of Significance. Consistent with the methodology used in the Placer County, a significant impact to air quality would occur if an individual project allowed under the General Plan Update would:

- *Violate any ambient air quality standard;*
- *Contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or*
- *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

In addition, a significant impact would occur if a project would:

- *Result in population growth that exceeds the growth estimates incorporated into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's (PCAPCD) Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP); or*
- *Cause emission increases that exceed the PCAPCD's major stationary source definition for the new source review (NSR) rule. For ozone precursors, those thresholds currently equal 50 tons per year for NOx and ROG. For CO and PM10, those thresholds are 100 tons per year.*

As a General Plan Update, it is inappropriate to evaluate any particular development project against these thresholds, but rather to compare the overall growth projected against regional growth projections. Because of the magnitude of development, it is presumed that many individual projects would exceed the project-specific thresholds described above, and shown in Table AQ-4 below:

Table AQ-4
Placer County APCD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Thresholds (lb/day) For Implementation of Mitigation Measures	Thresholds (lb/day) For General Significance
Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC)	10	82
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x)	10	82
Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)	10	136
Particulate Matter < 10 Microns (PM_{10})	82	82
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550	550

Source: PCAPCD, 1998

Key Issues. The draft General Plan Update does not identify any key issues that directly pertain to the issue of air quality. However, it is a General Plan goal to *"help protect air quality in the Sacramento region."* The Circulation Element also identifies the importance of alternative forms of transportation (bicycles and transit), which would indirectly improve air quality.

Potential Impacts. As shown in Table 2 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, buildout under the General Plan Update would accommodate up to 3,851 dwelling units, an increase of 1,631 units over current levels. This would accommodate a population of up to 10,400. SACOG projects a population of 12,000 for Loomis in 2020. General Plan buildout would be less than anticipated by regional growth forecasts, which form the basis for regional air quality planning efforts. Therefore, the Draft General Plan Update is considered consistent with forecasted population projections. Air emissions resulting from buildout would therefore be less than anticipated by regional plans.

However, individual projects will undoubtedly result in significant impacts requiring mitigation. Impacts would likely occur during both construction and operation phases, and would be exacerbated by cumulative regional development and the associated increase in

automobile traffic that would result. Individual project operation would not only include vehicular emissions, but would also include pollutants from landscape maintenance equipment, residential heating sources (natural gas heaters, fireplaces, and wood stoves), and other activities that generate air pollution. Both construction and operational emissions could contribute to both regional pollutant and localized pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be significant, and although proposed General Plan policy direction would help achieve regional air quality goals, impacts would likely remain significant.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The proposed General Plan Update includes the following policies intended to promote regional air quality:

- **Policy CRE (Natural Resources) 3.** Loomis shall contribute toward the attainment of State and Federal air quality standards in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin.

- **Policy CE (Bicycle Facilities) 1.** The Town shall promote bicycle travel, as appropriate, and shall pursue all available sources of funding for the development and improvement of bicycle facilities.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service) 1.** The Town will promote and support a safe, efficient, and coordinated public transit system that meets residents' needs, reduces congestion, improves the environment, and helps provide a viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through the Town of Loomis.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service) 2.** The Town should work with Placer County Transit and other transit providers to plan and implement public transportation services within the Town that are timely, cost-effective, and responsive to growth patterns and transit demand.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service) 4.** The Town should support efforts to provide demand-responsive service ("paratransit") and other transportation services for those unable to use conventional transit.

Implementation of these policies would serve to reduce overall air quality impacts. To minimize air quality impacts from individual projects in the Town, it is recommended that the following policies be incorporated to ensure that the effects of land development on local and regional air quality are considered and mitigated to the extent feasible:

- **Additional Policy AQ-1.** The Town shall require carbon monoxide modeling for development projects that, in combination with regionally cumulative traffic increases, would result in a total of 800 or more trips at an affected intersection or cause the level of service to drop to D or lower at the intersection.

- **Additional Policy AQ-2.** The Town shall support the Placer County Air Pollution Control District in its efforts to develop a feasible program to meet emission reduction requirements during the environmental review of all development proposals whose emissions exceed applicable significance thresholds.

- **Additional Policy AQ-3.** The Town shall encourage that large residential projects be phased or timed to be coordinated with development that provides primary wage-earner jobs.

- **Additional Policy AQ-4.** When appropriate, the Town shall require new development projects to submit an air quality analysis for review and approval. Based on the analysis, the Town may require appropriate mitigation measures consistent with the latest version of the AQAP.

- **Additional Policy AQ-5.** New development shall pay its fair share of the cost to provide alternative transportation systems, including bikeways, pedestrian paths, and bus stop facilities.

- **Additional Policy AQ-6.** The Town shall require that new developments dedicate land sufficient for park-and-ride lots, when the location is appropriate for such facilities.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these measures as they relate to future development projects in Loomis would be expected to reduce air emissions associated with buildout under the Draft General Plan Update to the extent feasible. However, impacts associated with individual development projects, and their contribution to decreased air quality, would remain significant and unavoidable.

3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Flora and Fauna)

Setting

This section provides a generalized overview of the vegetation and wildlife resources found within the planning area. It includes sections on plant communities and wildlife habitat, special status plant and animal species, and a discussion of wildlife movement corridors.

Plant Communities and Wildlife Habitat. The planning area includes both urban and rural elements in a topographically diverse setting. As such, it supports a variety of natural and artificial plant communities and wildlife habitat, as shown in Table BIO-1:

Table BIO-1. Planning Area Habitat and Sensitivity

Plant Community/Habitat	Sensitivity *
Oak Woodland and Savanna	Sensitive
Riparian and Stream Habitat	Sensitive
Wetlands	Sensitive
Grassland	Common
Chaparral	Common
Urban Landscape	Artificial
Agriculture	Artificial

* See text following for explanation of this notation

These habitat types are grouped by sensitivity, as described below.

Sensitive Natural Communities. For the purpose of this report, a sensitive natural community refers to a habitat which, if substantially degraded or eliminated, would result in significant impacts under CEQA on wildlife, plants, or fish. In the planning area, oak woodland and savanna, riparian and stream habitat, and wetlands are considered sensitive plant communities. These are given special consideration because they provide important ecological functions, including water quality maintenance, stream bank stabilization, the provision of essential habitat for wildlife and fisheries resources. These communities are typically limited in extent compared to their historical distribution due to development activity. Sensitive natural communities are afforded special consideration under federal, state and county laws. A brief description of these communities follows.

Oak Woodland and Savanna. Blue oak woodland, interior live oak woodland, and valley oak savanna are the dominant oak species that occur throughout the planning area.

- *Blue oak woodland* occurs primarily in the portions of the planning area that support shallow or infertile soils. Typically, blue oak woodland includes a mixture of the following plants: blue oak, foothill pine, buck brush, coffee berry and various grassland species.

- *Interior live oak woodland* occurs in lower-lying portions of the planning area, typically along riparian and stream corridors. In some area, interior live oaks form a dense

woodland with an understory comprised of annual and perennial grassland species. In other areas, interior live oaks intermix with foothill pine, California buckeye, buck brush, coyote brush, poison oak, coffee berry and grassland species.

- *Valley oak savanna* occurs on deep alluvial soils along streams and riparian corridors in the low-lying portions of the planning area. Several valley oak savanna communities contain large, heritage-size valley oaks. The understory in a valley oak savanna is usually composed of pasture grassland and annual grassland species.

Oak woodland and savanna provide shelter, breeding, and foraging habitat for many of the wildlife species typically found in grassland or chaparral habitats. Oak acorns are an important food source for wild turkeys, acorn woodpeckers, northern flickers, and mule deer. Oaks also provide nest sites for western gray squirrels and cavity-nesting birds, including acorn woodpeckers, northern flickers, and white-breasted nuthatches.

Riparian and Stream Habitat. Riparian communities develop in areas with high water tables that support seasonal and perennial (permanent) surface water. Riparian communities are common along streams, ponds, and swales in the planning area, most notably Secret Ravine and Antelope Creek. There are many variations of riparian habitat types. Three basic types commonly found in the planning area include mixed riparian woodland, riparian forest, and willow scrub. These are described below.

- *Mixed riparian woodland* is the dominant community in the planning area, and is characterized by intermixed layers of trees, shrubs and herbaceous species. Typical species include Fremont's cottonwood, valley oak, willows, California blackberry, Himalayan blackberry, California rose, blue elderberry, poison oak, sedges, rushes and grasses.

- *Riparian forest* is found in the planning area, particularly along Secret Ravine. Two basic types of riparian forest are found: cottonwood and oak. They are both structurally complex and varied plant communities. Cottonwood riparian forest is characterized by a canopy of Fremont's cottonwood, valley oak, and alders, overtopping a tangle of Himalayan blackberry, poison oak, wild honeysuckle, and arroyo willow. The canopy of oak riparian forest is dominated by mature valley oaks, with scattered black willow. The understory is comprised of poison oak, pipevine, creeping wild rye, and Himalayan blackberry.

- *Willow scrub* is an early-colonizing riparian community dominated by sandbar willow, mugwort, rush and sedge.

Riparian and stream communities provide the highest quality habitat for wildlife in the planning area. The multi-layered riparian community provides escape cover, forage and nesting opportunities for a variety of species. Typical wildlife that are found in riparian and stream habitats include California quail, Bewick's wren, song sparrow, red-shouldered hawk, Cooper's hawk, raccoon, coyote, cottontail, opossum, striped skunk, gray fox, and mule deer.

Wetlands. Wetlands include a variety of habitats that are characterized by a prevalence of hydrophytic (water-loving) vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. Natural and artificially-created wetlands exist throughout the low-lying portions of the planning area, typically along streams or in topographic depressions. Wetland types in the planning area include perennial streams, ponds, and seasonal drainage, including vernal pools.

Seasonal freshwater wetlands occur within perennial grasslands as swales and shallow depressions underlain by slowly permeable soils. These wetlands are typically wet from November to June. Vegetation is a mix of wetland and upland species including perennial ryegrass, popcornflower, creek monkeyflower, spikerush, soft chess, tarweed, long-beak filaree, and medusa-head grass. Vernal pools occur on the impermeable Mehrten breccia that exists on ridge tops within the planning area.

Vernal pools, intermittent drainages, and other seasonal wetlands represent unique natural resource habitats within the study area and the state. Vernal pools are considered sensitive habitat areas not only due to their limited occurrence and distribution, but also because they support several unique, and often rare, plant and animal species that are endemic to this kind of habitat. Intermittent drainages and seasonally wet swales within the planning area, while typically low in plant and wildlife species diversity, provide important watershed sources to vernal pools and are also limited in occurrence and distribution.

A comprehensive wetland survey for the planning area has not been conducted. Delineation of wetlands within the planning area has been conducted sporadically, and generally in conjunction with development proposals.

Many wildlife species depend on wetland habitats for foraging, nesting, and cover. Ponds in the planning area provide important resting and foraging habitat for migrating birds, such as Canada goose, mallard, and cinnamon teal. Wetlands also provide habitat for ring-necked duck, American coot, great blue heron, great egret, and black phoebe.

Common Natural Communities. Common natural communities are native landscapes that have not been altered by farming or other land disturbance. Grassland and chaparral are considered common natural communities because of their abundance in the planning area and throughout California.

Grasslands. Grassland is an herbaceous community characterized by annual and perennial grasses and forbs. Grasslands occur in pastures, along fence rows, and more extensively in undisturbed rural areas. Three types of grassland associations occur in the planning area: annual grassland, native perennial grassland, and pasture grassland.

- *Annual grasslands* are dominated by annual grasses intermixed with annual forbs and perennial forbs, including wild oat, ripgut brome, soft chess, fescue, clover, summer mustard, wild radish, yellow-star-thistle, and elegant clarkia.

- *Native perennial grasslands* are dominated by native grasses such as purple needlegrass, woodland ryegrass, and California melic grass. Perennial grasslands also typically support a larger number of native forb species than do annual grasslands. These include harvest brodiaea, soap plant, tarplant, lupine, and mariposa lily. These perennial grasslands typically occur on north-facing, mesic slopes near oak woodlands and savannas.

- *Pasture grasslands* are typically dominated by perennial sod-forming grasses, such as harding grass, orchard grass, Kentucky fescue, and common velvet grass. Pasture grasslands are maintained through artificial irrigation systems.

Grasslands provide nesting and foraging habitat for several wildlife species, including red-tailed hawk, American pipit, western meadowlark, lesser goldfinch, American kestrel, California ground squirrel, and California vole.

Chaparral. Chaparral communities are characterized by evergreen, hard-leaved shrubs adapted to dry, infertile soils. The herbaceous layer is usually sparse because chaparral shrubs produce growth-inhibiting oils that prevent the establishment of herbaceous species. Two types of chaparral are found within the planning area: buck brush and chamise chaparral. Buck brush chaparral is dominated by buck brush with scattered chamise, toyon, coffee berry, poison oak, and interior live oak. Chamise chaparral occurs on recently burned hillsides and is usually dominated by chamise. Chaparral provides high-quality cover and roosting habitat for western rattlesnake, California thrasher, wrentit, California quail, gray fox and mule deer.

Artificial Plant Communities. Artificial plant communities are human-created landscapes that provide some wildlife habitat value. Urban landscape and agricultural areas are the primary artificial communities located in the planning area.

Urban Landscape. Urban landscape exists around commercial, residential and park sites within the planning area. Urban landscape is composed of non-native plants, shrubs and trees. These areas provide low-quality habitat for a variety of native and non-native wildlife, including northern mockingbird, European starling, house sparrow, house finch, acorn woodpecker, mourning dove, Brewer's blackbird, gopher snake, and western toad.

Agricultural Land. Orchards and irrigated crops are the primary types of agricultural activity within the planning area. Agriculture is dispersed throughout the planning area, forming a mosaic between grasslands, oak woodland, and riparian habitats.

Areas along fence rows and drainage ditches that support some remnant native vegetation or weedy species provide limited habitat for common wildlife species, which include: western meadowlark, red-tailed hawk, American kestrel, and red-winged blackbird. Migrant birds also use agricultural areas for winter foraging and roosting. Typical migrant species that occur in the planning area include rough-legged hawk, American pipit, Canada goose, and house finch.

Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species. Special-status species are plants and animals legally protected, either under federal, state, or local law, or through documentation put forth by the scientific community. Table BIO-2 illustrates the most commonly-recognized definitions of what qualifies as "special status."

Table BIO-2. Definition of Special-Status Species

Plant Species	Animal Species
♦ Plants listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17.12); ♦ Plants that are Category 1 candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (55 CFR 6184, 2-21-90); ♦ Plants that meet the definition of rare or endangered under CEQA (*CEQA Guideline*s, Section 15380); ♦ Plants considered by the CNPS to be "rare, threatened or endangered" in California (Lists 1B and 2 in Skinner and Pavlik, 1994); ♦ Plants considered by the CNPS about which more information is needed and plants of limited distribution (Lists 3 and 4 in Skinner and Pavlik, 1994); ♦ Plants listed or proposed for listing by the State as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (14 CCR 670.5); ♦ Plants listed under the California Native Plant Protection Act (CFG Code 1900 et. Seq.); ♦ Plants considered sensitive by other federal agencies, state and local agencies or jurisdictions; ♦ Plants considered sensitive or unique by the scientific community or occurring at the limits of its natural range (*CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G).	♦ Animals listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17.11 and various notices); ♦ Animals that are Category 1 candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (54 CFR 554); ♦ Animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under CEQA (*CEQA Guideline*s, Section 15380); ♦ Animals listed or proposed for listing by the State as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (14 CCR 670.5); ♦ Animal species of special concern to the CDFG (Remsen, 1978 for birds; Williams, 1986 for mammals) ♦ Animal species that are fully-protected in California (CFG Code, Section 3511, 4700 and 5050)

Special-status species include those that are listed as rare, threatened, or endangered by the CDFG or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; candidates for either state or federal listing; species designated as "fully protected" or "species of special concern" by the CDFG. The CDFG utilizes the California Natural Diversity Database (NDDB) to document occurrences of special status species. The NDDB includes information on plant species prepared by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Table BIO-2 shows the special status species in the area based on the literature and database review. They are described in more detail in Technical Background Report prepared for this EIR.

Table BIO-3. Special Status Species Potentially-Occurring in the Town of Loomis

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat
PLANTS			
Big-scale balsamroot	*Balsamorhiza macrolepis* var *macrolepis*	1B	GR
Dwarf downingia	*Downingia pusilla*	2	VP,WET
Legenere	*Legenere limosa*	1B	VP
Hispid bird's-beak	*Cordylanthus mollis ssp hispidus*	1B	akaline soils
Boggs lake hedge-hyssop	*Gratiola heterosepala*	1B	VP,WET
INVERTEBRATES			
Vernal pool fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta lynchi*	FT	VP
Conservancy fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta conservatio*	FE	VP
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp	*Lepidurus packardi*	FE	VP
California linderiella	*Linderiella occidentalis*	SA	VP
Valley Elderberry longhorn beetle	*Desmocercus californicus dimorphus*	FT	WDL
AMPHIBIANS and REPTILES			
Western spadefoot	*Scaphiopus hammondii*	CSC	SAV,GR
Foothill yellow-legged frog	*Rana boylei*	CSC	WET
California red-legged frog	*Rana aurora draytoni*	FT, CSC	Stream pools
Northwestern pond turtle	*Clemmys marmorata marmorata*	CSC	Stream pools
BIRDS			
Great blue heron (rookery)	*Ardea herodias*	SA	WDL
Cooper's hawk (nesting)	*Accipiter cooperii*	CSC	WDL,GR
Sharp-shinned hawk (nesting)	*Accipiter striatus*	CSC	WDL
Tricolored blackbird (nesting)	*Agelaius tricolor*	CSC	WET
Golden eagle (nest & winter)	*Aquila chrysaetos*	CSC	GR, CH, WDL
Long-eared owl (nesting)	*Asio otus*	CSC	WDL
Short-eared owl (nesting)	*Asio flammeus*	CSC	GR
Burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia*	CSC	GR
Swainson's hawk (nesting)	*Buteo swainsoni*	ST	WDL, GR
Ferruginous hawk (wintering)	*Buteo regalis*	CSC	GR
Northern harrier (nesting)	*Circus cyaneus*	CSC	GR
White-tailed kite (nesting)	*Elanus caeruleus*	SA	WDL, GR
Merlin (wintering)	*Falco columbarius*	CSC	WDL, GR
Prairie falcon (nesting)	*Falco mexicanus*	CSC	GR
Loggerhead shrike	*Lanius ludovicianus*	CSC	GR
Yellow-breasted chat (nesting)	*Icteria virens*	CSC	WDL
MAMMALS			
Pallid bat	*Antrozous pallida*	CSC	GR, WDL
Townsend's big-eared bat	*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*	CSC	GR, WDL
American badger	*Taxidea taxus*	SA	GR

KEY:

STATUS CODES:

FE	*Federally listed Endangered*	*SE*	*State-listed Endangered*
FT	*Federally listed Threatened*	*ST*	*State-listed Threatened*
PFE	*Proposed Federal Endangered*	*SR*	*State-listed Rare (plants only)*
FC	*Federal Candidate*	*SCE*	*State Endangered Candidate*
SCT	*State Threatened Candidate*	*1B*	*CNPS: Rare, Threatened, Endangered in CA*
CSC	*California Species of Special Concern*	*2*	*CNPS: Rare, Threatened, Endangered*
SA	*Special Animal per CDFG, March 1998*		*in CA but more common elsewhere*

HABITAT CODES:

GR	*Grassland*	*SAV*	*Savanna*
CH	*Chaparral*	*WDL*	*Oak/Riparian Woodland*
WET	*Wetland*	*VP*	*Vernal Pool*

Source: CDFG, June 18, 1998; CDFG March 1998, CDFG April 1998.

Special-Status Plants. Five special status plants have been reported in the general vicinity of the Town, but none have been reported in the planning area. However, based on known habitat requirements and distributions, the special-status plants shown in Table BIO-2 have the potential to occur in the planning area. Several of these plants are associated with vernal pools that occur in old volcanic mud flows, which are generally located southeast of the planning area. However, they could also occur in vernal pools within the planning area.

Special-Status Wildlife. The Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Data Base (CDFG) listed one special-status wildlife species, the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, as known to occur in the planning area. However, based on known habitat requirements and distributions, any of the special-status species listed in Table BIO-2 have the potential to occur in the planning area. Many site-specific wildlife surveys have been conducted in the planning area and Table BIO-3 lists the wildlife observed during several surveys. Special-status wildlife species have been marked with an asterisk.

Table BIO-4. Wildlife Species Observed in the Planning Area

Common Name	Scientific Name	Source
Birds		
Cooper's hawk *	*Accipiter cooperii*	2,4
Red-winged blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*	2
Mallard	*Anas platyrhynchos*	4
Scrub jay	*Aphelocoma coerulescens*	1,2,4
Red-tailed hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*	1
Red-shouldered hawk	*Buteo lineatus*	1
California quail	*Callipepla californica*	1, 4
American goldfinch	*Carduelis tristis*	4
Purple finch	*Carpodacus purpureus*	4
Turkey vulture	*Cathartes aura*	4
Wrentit	*Chamaea fasciata*	1
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferus*	1
Northern flicker	*Colaptes auratus*	1, 2
Western wood-pewee	*Contopus sordidulus*	1
American crow	*Corvus brachyrhynchos*	1
Raven	*Corvus corax*	2
Warbler sp.	*Dendroica* sp.	4
Black-shouldered kite *	*Elanus caeruleus*	1, 2, 4
Brewer's blackbird	*Euphagus cyanacephalus*	1
Acorn woodpecker	*Melanerpes formicivorus*	2, 4
Northern mockingbird	*Mimus polyglottos*	4
Ash-throated flycatcher	*Myiarchus cinerascens*	4
Plain titmouse	*Parus inornatus*	2, 4
Savannah sparrow	*Passerculus sandwichensis*	4
Ring-necked pheasant	*Phasianus colchicus*	4
Grosbeak	*Pheucticus* sp.	4
Nuttall's woodpecker	*Picoides nuttallii*	1, 4
Bushtit	*Psaltriparus minimus*	1
Black phoebe	*Sayornis nigrians*	1, 4
Western bluebird	*Sialia mexicana*	4
White-breasted nuthatch	*Sitta carolinensis*	4
Western meadowlark	*Sturnella neglecta*	1
European starling	*Sturnis vulgaris*	1
Barn owl	*Tyto alba*	1

Solitary vireo	*Vireo solitarius*	4
Mourning dove	*Zenaida macroura*	1, 2, 4
Golden-crowned sparrow	*Zonotrichia atricapilla*	2
White-crowned sparrow	*Zonotrichia leucophrys*	2
Mammals		
Coyote	*Canis latrans*	1
Black-tailed jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus*	1
Black-tailed deer	*Odocoileus hemionous*	1
Raccoon	*Procyon lotor*	2
Skunk	*Mephitus mephitus*	5
Botta's pocket gopher	*Thomomys bottae*	1, 2
Reptiles and Amphibians		
Western pond turtle *	*Clemmys marmorata*	4
Western skink	*Eumeces skiltonianus*	2
Western fence lizard	*Sceloprus occidentalis*	2, 4
Alligator lizard	*Gerrhonotus sp.*	4
Pacific chorus frog	*Pseudacris (Hyla) regilla*	2, 4
Bullfrog	*Rana catesbeiana*	4
Common garter snake	*Thamnophis sirtalis*	4
Side-blotched lizard	*Uta stansburiana*	4
Fish		
Sacramento sucker	*Catostomus occidentalis*	3
Brown bullhead	*Ictalurus nebulosus*	3
Green sunfish	*Lepomis cyanellus*	3
Bluegill	*Lepomis macrochirus*	3
Largemouth bass	*Micropterus salmoides*	3
Sacramento squawfish	*Ptychocheilus grandis*	3

Key:

1 *Shadowbrook Recirculated Draft EIR*, ESA, 1997
2 *K-8 Elementary School Site Draft EIR*, Quad, 1994
3 Jones & Stokes Secret Ravine survey, March 1988
4 Laird Road survey, Jones & Stokes, 1993.
5 Town Staff, 1998

Aquatic Habitat. Streams in the planning area provide important habitat for several fish species. Portions of Secret Ravine and Antelope Creek provide the highest quality habitat because these waterways support moderate flows, clear water, rocky stream beds, and overhanging riparian vegetation.

Secret Ravine is a perennial stream used by fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead trout for spawning and rearing of juveniles (Town of Loomis, *Turtle Island Draft EIR*, 1996). The chinook salmon spawn from November to January, and most fry immediately migrate downstream to the Sacramento River and through the Delta to the ocean. Steelhead trout spawn from March to April and may remain up to two years in Secret Ravine before migrating. Sampling of Secret Ravine in 1988 identified Sacramento squawfish, bluegill, green sunfish, brown bullhead, Sacramento sucker, and largemouth bass (Jones & Stokes, 1988). No fall-run Chinook salmon were observed at that time, although the Department of Fish and Game had been stocking Secret Ravine since 1983 to increase fish production.

Antelope Creek is a perennial stream that provides habitat for several game and nongame species, including golden shiner, bluegill, green sunfish, and mosquitofish. In addition, Both Secret Ravine and Antelope Creek provide habitat for bullfrog and Pacific chorus frog, as well as potential habitat for northwestern pond turtle and California red-legged frog.

Regulatory Framework.

Special-Status Species. The federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (50 CFR 17) provides legal protection and requires definition of critical habitat and development of recovery plans for plant and animal species in danger of extinction. California has a parallel mandate embodied in the California Endangered Species Act of 1984 and the California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977. These laws regulate the listing of plant and animal species as endangered, threatened, or in the case of plants, rare.

The federal Endangered Species Act requires federal agencies to make a finding on all federal actions, including the approval by an agency of a public or private action, as to the potential to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species potentially impacted by the action. Section 9 of the federal Endangered Species Act prohibits the "take" of any member of an endangered species. "Take" is defined by the act as, "...to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." USFWS has further defined the terms "harass" and "harm." Harass is defined as "*...an intentional or negligent act or omission that creates the likelihood of injury to a listed species by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering*." Harm is further defined to include "*...significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns such as breeding, feeding, or sheltering.*" Section 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act permits the incidental "take" of an endangered species if the take is "incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity."

Species listed by the State are not necessarily protected by the federal protection statutes. Under the State laws, the CDFG is empowered to review projects for their potential impacts to listed species and their habitats.

In addition to formal endangered and threatened listings, the State of California also lists *Species of Special Concern* based on limited distribution, declining populations, diminishing habitat, or unusual scientific, recreational, or educational value. These species are not afforded the same legal protection as listed species, but may be added to official lists in the future.

Federal Candidate species include taxa for which the USFWS currently has compiled substantial information on biological vulnerability and potential threats in order to support the appropriateness of proposing to list the taxa as endangered or threatened species. The State of California also maintains lists for Candidate-Endangered Species (SCE) and Candidate-Threatened Species (SCT).

Wetland Regulation. Wetlands are defined by the federal government as "*...those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.*" This definition was developed for the purpose of identifying wetlands subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which is the principal law regulating the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the US. This definition differs from the functional definition of wetlands used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which defines wetlands for inventory (not regulatory)

purposes as "*...lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface, or the land is covered by shallow water.*"

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service definition includes both vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands, recognizing that some areas may lack vegetation (e.g., mud flats, rocky shores, gravel bars, sand beaches), but still provide functional wetland habitat elements for fish and wildlife. Some FWS-defined wetlands are not necessarily subject to regulation under Section 404, which formerly defines wetlands based on the presence of hydric soils, hydrology, and hydrophytic vegetation. It is important to note, however, that the California Department of Fish and Game has adopted the FWS definition as a matter of policy (Rollins 1987). As such, wetland impacts are generally more expansive under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) than under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Clean Water Act. Under CEQA, impacts can also be determined significant for areas that do not meet Federal wetland criteria if they are considered locally rare or unique. Wetland communities are considered Rare by the California Department of Fish and Game.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has regulatory authority for certain fill activities within "waters of the United States." These waters include perennial and intermittent streams, wetlands, vernal pools, natural lakes and ponds. All these wetland habitat types can be subject to regulatory jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. The significance threshold is established for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with this project by assessing the current status of each sensitive biotic resource at global, statewide, county/regional, and locally. Federal, state, and local regulations and policies, as well as the intent of CEQA, are used in identifying regulated resources while scientific data on each biotic resource are used to establish rarity and sensitivity levels.

Guidance for determining significance thresholds is based on the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and local/regional general plans and ordinances. Using these guidelines, the proposed project would have a significant impact on associated biological resources if it would:

- *Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals in the community where it is located;*
- *Substantially affect a rare or endangered species;*
- *Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;*
- *Substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife or plants;*
- *Involve the use, production or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to animal or plant populations in the area affected; or*
- *Involve the alteration or conversion of biological resources identified as significant within the county or region. These resources include:*
  - *-Locally important species; and*
  - *-Locally important communities.*

Specifically, the following activities would constitute a significant impact on biological resources:

- *Loss of individuals of or habitat for special-status species.*
- *Loss of sensitive vegetation/habitat types, including wetlands.*
- *Loss of heritage oak trees (trees greater than 6 inches in diameter at breast height).*
- *Loss of raptor nests.*
- *Introduction of invasive exotic species.*
- *Disruption of wildlife migration or movement.*

Key Issues. The draft General Plan Conservation of Resources Element identifies the following key issue that pertains to the preservation of biological resources:

- *Loomis needs to strengthen Town requirements for protecting stream corridors and riparian habitat for wildlife and plant species, groundwater supplies, visual qualities, and recreational opportunities.*

Potential Impacts. Future development within the Town would occur near streams, creeks, and within other areas that would adversely impact biological resources. Specifically, the following mechanisms for causing impacts are anticipated to possibly occur when individual developments are implemented:

- Removing oak trees
- Filling wetlands
- Creating barriers to wildlife movement or migration.
- Destroying or disturbing active raptor bird nests.

Development that could occur within the current Town limits under the Draft General Plan would primarily consist of infill development in already urbanized areas. Such development would not be expected to adversely affect important biological habitats or plant species. However, some development would entail reuse of lightly-used rural lands, some of which supports potential habitat. Development near streams, including Antelope Creek and Secret Ravine, also has the potential of adversely affecting riparian habitat. The most notable example of development near sensitive riparian areas includes the commercial development site at I-80 and Horseshoe Bar Road, which would be located near Secret Ravine. The EIR for that project has proposed mitigation measures, including setbacks, which would provide some degree of mitigation. Similarly, individual development projects at other locations in the Town would be required to provide mitigation for impacts to the biological environment.

Development, particularly on the urban fringe, could result in the removal of heritage oaks, or grassland habitat that supports sensitive species. Such habitat provides foraging and nesting opportunities for several sensitive species, including raptors. Any of the sensitive species listed in Tables BIO-2 and BIO-3 could be affected, and the fact that several previously-prepared environmental documents suggests their presence at various locations throughout the community, significant impacts are likely to occur at other locations.

Development can increase impervious surface and result in greater runoff that can carry sediment and degrade stream water quality. These effects can negatively affect vegetation within stream corridors, as well as downstream locations into which the streams empty.

Secret Ravine is a perennial stream used by fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead trout for spawning and rearing of juveniles (Town of Loomis, *Turtle Island Draft EIR*, 1996). Both Secret Ravine and Antelope Creek provide habitat for bullfrog and Pacific chorus frog, as well as potential habitat for northwestern pond turtle and California red-legged frog. If water quality is degraded, impacts to the continued use of this stream by these species would be significant.

The loss of vernal pools, particularly in areas overlain by mehrten deposits, could result in significant impacts to several kinds of fairy shrimp. Although no vernal pools are known to occur in the Town, there are areas overlain by Mehrten deposits in the western portion of the community, west of Sierra College Boulevard, on the hilltop that separates Loomis from Rocklin. Mehrten deposits are also found in the southernmost part of the Town, in the vicinity of Ridge Park Drive. Neither area contains land slated for future development. Impacts to vernal pools are likely to be less than significant.

Oak woodland is prevalent throughout much of the planning area, and new development has the potential to result in the removal of individual trees, which could affect the quality of habitat. This is a potentially significant impact.

Loss of riparian areas, oak woodland, and other habitat could adversely affect many wildlife species that depend on such habitat, including mammals, reptiles and birds, as listed in Table BIO-2.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The proposed General Plan Update includes the following policies intended to protect biological resources:

- **Policy CR (Natural Resources) 1.** The streams of Loomis are among the most significant and valuable of the Town's natural resources. Development adjacent to streams shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to avoid adverse impacts on riparian vegetation, stream bank stability, and stream water quality to the maximum extent feasible. These policies shall apply to all watercourses shown as blue lines on the most recent United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps applicable to the Town.

    a. Proposed structures and grading shall be set back the greater of: 50 feet from the outermost extent of riparian vegetation as defined in the Zoning Ordinance; 100 feet from the centerline of the stream; or outside of the 100-year flood plain. A lesser setback may be approved where site-specific studies of biology and hydrology, prepared by qualified professionals approved by the Town, demonstrate that a lesser setback will provide equal protection for stream resources and will not increase the risk of flooding.

    b. Proposed development shall include surface water drainage facilities that are designed, constructed, and maintained to ensure that the increased runoff caused

by development does not contribute to the erosion of stream banks, or introduce pollutants into watercourses.

c. Land uses and development within the setback areas required by this policy shall be limited to: the grazing of livestock at half or less of the animal densities allowed by the Zoning Ordinance; open wire fencing to confine livestock; bridges; public utilities and infrastructure; and other uses allowed by the applicable zoning district as permitted or conditional uses, with conditional use permit approval.

d. The following activities are prohibited within stream corridor setbacks: filling or dumping; the disposal of agricultural wastes; channelization or dams; the use of pesticides that may be carried into stream waters; grading, or the removal of natural vegetation within the required setback area, except with grading permit approval.

- **Policy CR-(Natural Resources)-2.** Individual heritage trees and significant stands of heritage trees shall be preserved. Healthy native trees shall be removed or significantly trimmed only when necessary because of safety concerns, conflicts with utility lines and other infrastructure, the need for thinning to maintain a healthy stand of trees, or where there is no feasible alternative to removal. Proposed development shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to preserve individual heritage trees and significant stands of heritage trees, and provide for the protection of root zones and the continuing health of the trees. When trees are removed, they shall be replaced in sufficient numbers to maintain the volume of the Town's overall tree canopy over a 20-year period. Tree removal within stream corridors is also subject to the above policy on stream corridor protection.

- **Policy CR-(Natural Resources)-4.** Loomis will work cooperatively with state, regional, and local agencies in protecting natural resources.

In addition, the Conservation of Resources Element includes the following implementation measure:

- The Town shall prepare and adopt a Tree Protection Ordinance which expands the current Heritage Tree Ordinance to identify specific species of trees to be protected and preserved, criteria and permit requirements for tree removal, requirements for the replacement of removed trees and maintenance of the Town's overall tree canopy, and requirements for the protection of retained trees during development project construction, and their long-term maintenance.

Implementation of these policies would serve to reduce overall impacts to biological resources. To minimize impacts from individual projects in the Town, it is recommended that the following policies be incorporated to ensure that the effects of development on biological resources are mitigated to the extent feasible:

- **Additional Policy BIO-1.** The Town shall encourage the use of natural stormwater drainage systems to preserve and enhance existing natural features. The Town shall promote flood control efforts that maintain natural conditions within riparian areas.

- **Additional Policy BIO-2.** The Town shall require that industrial and commercial uses that store or use hazardous materials provide a buffer zone sufficient to protect public safety, including the safety of nearby wildlife.

- **Additional Policy BIO-3.** The Town shall require that development projects proposing to encroach into a creek corridor or creek/wetland setback to do one or more of the following, in descending order of desirability:
    a. Avoid the disturbance of riparian vegetation;
    b. Replace riparian vegetation (on-site, in-kind);
    c. Restore another section of creek (in-kind); and/or
    d. Pay a mitigation fee for restoration elsewhere (e.g., wetland mitigation banking program)

- **Additional Policy BIO-4.** Where creek or wetland protection is required or proposed, the Town shall require public and private development to:
    a. Preserve creek corridors and setbacks through easements or dedications. Parcel lines or easements shall be located to optimize resource protection;
    b. Designate such easement or dedication areas as open space.
    c. Protect creek corridors and their habitat value by 1) providing adequate setbacks; 2) maintaining creek corridors in their natural state; 3) employing restoration techniques, where necessary and appropriate; 4) using riparian vegetation within creek corridors; 5) prohibit the planting of invasive, non-native plants within creek setbacks; and 6) avoiding tree removal within creek corridors.
    d. Use techniques that ensure development will not cause or worsen natural hazards near creeks, and will include erosion and sediment control practices such as 1) turbidity screens (to minimize erosion and siltation); and 2) temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas.

- **Additional Policy BIO-5.** The Town shall discourage grading activities during the rainy season, unless adequately mitigated, to avoid sedimentation of creeks and damage to riparian areas.

- **Additional Policy BIO-6.** The Town shall require that newly-created parcels include adequate space outside of wetland and riparian setback areas to ensure that property owners will not place improvements within areas that require protection.

- **Additional Policy BIO-7.** The Town shall support the concept of "no net loss" of wetlands though any combination of the following, in decreasing order of desirability: 1) avoidance of riparian habitat; 2) minimization of impacts to the resource; and 3) compensation, in the form of mitigation banking to protect wetland habitat or individual species that rely on this habitat. The Town shall cooperate with regulating agencies to ensure that concerns are adequately addressed.

- **Additional Policy BIO-8.** Prior to approval of discretionary development permits involving parcels near significant ecological resource areas, the Town shall require, as part of the environmental review process, a biotic resources evaluation by a qualified biologist. The biologist shall follow accepted protocols for surveys (if needed) and subsequent procedures that may be necessary to complete the evaluation. "Significant Ecological Areas" shall include, but not be limited to:

    a. Wetland areas;
    b. Stream environment zones;
    c. Suitable habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species;
    d. Large areas of non-fragmented habitat, including oak woodlands and riparian habitat;
    e. Potential wildlife movement corridors; and
    f. Important spawning areas for anadramous fish.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these policies, in combination with Town ordinances, and state and federal regulatory protection, would reduce impacts to the extent possible. However, individual projects, as they are developed, could result in significant unavoidable impacts, which would be identified through the regulatory processes set forth, in part through the General Plan Update. Increased cumulative development throughout the region would also contribute to significant unavoidable impacts to biological resources.

3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

Archaeological Resources. The planning area is located in the region that was occupied by the Nisenan or Southern Maidu at the time of Euro-American contact. Nisenan territory included the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, Feather and American Rivers. Their villages were commonly located on ridges or large flats along major streams. However, the discovery of gold in the mid-18th century caused the near extinction of the native population and culture. The gold rush also provided a new historical context for the area, and is now itself considered an event that has produced significant cultural resources.

The planning area was included in an overall resources survey conducted by Placer County in the early 1990s. A comprehensive search conducted at the North Central Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory at CSU Sacramento showed 634 recorded prehistoric and historic sites countywide. Of this number, 52 were recorded in the general vicinity of the planning area., including the area upstream toward Penryn and Newcastle. The sites included 6 prehistoric villages with surface artifacts and bedrock mortars. Most other sites also included bedrock mortars. Historical sites in the area generally are associated with 19th century mining operations, and include ditches, foundations and mining equipment.

Very few sites have been found in Loomis. A survey of an undeveloped 322-acre site north of Wells Avenue found no sites in spite of the presence of many rock outcroppings (Town of Loomis, Sherwood Park Draft EIR, 1998). With the exception of the commercial development site near I-80/Horseshoe Bar Road, where archaeological sites were found near Secret Ravine, no sites were found for surveys associated with other recent projects, including the Town of Loomis Specific Plan (1988), and a proposed elementary school near No Name Lane (1994). The 1986 survey for the 105-acre Loomis Oaks project (southeast of the Rocklin Road/Barton Road intersection) found a single prehistoric milling station, but noted several nearby sites just outside the project area. Other recent development proposals, such as the one for the 22-acre Heritage Park Estates project, dismissed potential impacts to cultural resources in the Initial Study for the EIR after a previous survey had been conducted.

Nevertheless, less than 5% of the Town has been surveyed, and the conditions exist for discovering unknown cultural resources. According to the Placer County Department of Museums, the probability of prehistoric sites being found on any given parcel is moderate to high (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR*, 1993). This would be particularly true for sensitive areas, such as near creeks or terraces above creeks.

Paleontology. The geology of the planning area includes Cenozoic-era sedimentary rock formations, which potentially contain fossils. However, the expected abundance and kinds of fossils varies widely from place to place, according to the underlying geologic unit. The foothills of the Sierra Nevada are of particular interest to paleontologists because the area was once at or near the shoreline of an ancient sea that occupied the Central Valley. Sea level fluctuations caused alternating deposition of marine and non-marine sediments, creating conditions favorable for preserving fossils.

All but the youngest geologic formations have been tilted upward by the rise of the Sierra Nevada. Gradual long-term erosion has removed parts of these formations, exposing rocks that may contain fossils. In some places, such rocks may be overlaid by a thin layer of recently deposited sediment or soil.

The portions of Loomis that have the greatest potential to contain fossils are those underlain by Mehrten conglomerate, which are found in the extreme western and southern portions of the Town. Low-lying areas south of Horseshoe Bar Road are also potentially sensitive (Placer County, Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Draft Community Plan EIR, 1993). However, no fossil resources have been identified in recent environmental documentation for projects in the community.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) specifies criteria for evaluating the importance of cultural resources such as archaeological sites. An "important" archaeological resource is one that:

A) Is associated with an event or person of:
   - Recognized significance in California or American history, or
   - Recognized scientific importance in prehistory.

B) Can provide information which is both of demonstrable public interest and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable or archaeological research questions;

C) Has a special or particular quality such as oldest, best example, largest, or last surviving example of its kind;

D) Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity; or

E) Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.

Impacts are considered significant if future develop has the potential to disturb the integrity of an important archaeological or paleontological site, or disturb the integrity of historic resources.

Key Issues. The draft General Plan Conservation of Resources Element identifies the following key issue that pertains to the preservation of cultural resources:

- *A number of historical structures, primarily in the downtown area, have potential for adaptive reuse and enhancing the Town's rural, small town image.*

Potential Impacts. Development that could occur within the current Town limits under the Draft General Plan Update would primarily consist of infill development in already urbanized areas. Such development would not be expected to adversely affect important archaeological or fossil resources. However, retrofitting of historic structures in the downtown area has the potential to adversely affect the historic integrity of these structures.

In addition, development in rural areas has the potential to uncover or disturb currently unrecorded archaeological or historic resources.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The proposed General Plan Update includes the following policies intended to protect biological resources:

- **Policy CR (Cultural Resources)-1.** When feasible, Loomis shall encourage the reuse and revitalization of historic buildings on public property. Whenever possible, flexibility in development standards allowed by the Historic Building Code shall be offered to developers working with historic properties.

- **Policy CR (Cultural Resources)-2.** The demolition of buildings deemed historically or aesthetically valuable shall be prohibited in cases where alternatives for reuse are found to be feasible.

- **Policy CR (Cultural Resources)-3.** Loomis shall support the expansion and development of cultural facilities and programs, as a draw for visitors and residents to the downtown core.

These measures would generally be expected to avoid impacts to cultural resources. However, it is recommended that the following policies be added to provide further protection for archaeological sites.:

- **Additional Policy CR-1.** When feasible, and on public property, Loomis shall prohibit recreational activities that could damage or destroy archaeological sites in areas where archaeological sites have been identified.

- **Additional Policy CR-2.** As part of the environmental review process, the Town shall review all development proposals for their potential to disturb cultural resources. In areas where cultural resources are known to occur, give special consideration to development of facilities that enhance the operation, enjoyment, and maintenance of these areas.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these policies, along with suggested additional policies, would reduce potential general impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level. In addition, further regulatory protection provided by the state and federal government would provide additional protection.

3.5 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

Setting

Existing geologic conditions in the Loomis Planning Area are discussed in the Draft Public Health and Safety Element and technical Background Report. Potential geologic hazards present in portions of the planning area include ground shaking, liquefaction, landsliding, and soil expansiveness. Figure 4 shows a generalized geology map for the area.

The following summarizes the geologic setting of the area:

Regional Faulting. The major fault systems in the region tend to occur along the interface between differing geologic materials. The nearest major fault system near Loomis is the Foothills Fault System, which traverses Amador, El Dorado, and Placer counties in a path more than 350 kilometers long and several kilometers wide. Two segments of this system are relatively close to Loomis: the segment of the Bear Mountain Fault Zone (Spenceville Fault) between Folsom and Auburn, and the Melones Fault Zone, about 15 miles to the east.

No active faults are known to exist in Placer County, and no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones are designated in the County. The nearest known active fault that has been mapped is the Dunnigan Hills Fault, well to the northwest of the Town across the Central Valley.

Within the planning area, an inactive inferred fault was mapped across the area's southern boundary (Livingston, 1974). The potential for seismic events originating from this fault is considered low.

Seismic Hazards. The underlying geologic foundation of the region is a relatively unbroken granitic batholith that extends along the Sierra Nevada. During seismic events, this material tends to react as a uniform block, which has the effect of reducing ground movement, acceleration, and the likelihood of ground rupture. Consequently, the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) classifies the region as a low severity earthquake area. Typical seismic hazards include surface rupture, groundshaking, and various types of ground failure. The potential for these hazards to exist in the planning area is described below.

Surface rupture during earthquakes is typically limited to those areas immediately adjacent to the fault on which the event is occurring. Because the planning area contains no active faults, the likelihood of surface rupture in the area is considered low.

The most serious direct earthquake hazard is the damage or collapse of buildings caused by ***groundshaking***, which, in addition to property damage, can cause injury or death. Groundshaking is the primary seismic concern for Loomis. Portions of Loomis are located on alluvial deposits, which can increase the potential for groundshaking damage. As earthquake waves pass from more dense rock to less dense alluvial material, they tend to reduce velocity, but increase in amplitude. Ground motion lasts longer on loose, water-saturated materials than on solid rock. The potential for groundshaking may be considered highest on the alluvial deposits along the creeks and ravines in the northern portion of Loomis.

Figure 4. Geology Map
(same as Figure 3-2 in the Technical Background Report)

Typical effects such groundshaking could include cracked chimneys, moved furniture, and broken glassware inside structures. However, historic records suggest that the probability of these maximum events occurring in Loomis is very low.

Older buildings constructed before building codes were in effect are most likely to suffer damage in an earthquake. Many of Loomis' buildings are one or two stories high, and of wood frame construction, which is considered relatively resistant to earthquake damage. However, buildings made of unreinforced masonry are highly susceptible to damage from severe groundshaking. Several unreinforced masonry structures currently exist in Loomis, particularly in the downtown area. Some buildings include brick facades, which are highly susceptible to damage (and falling) in the event of an earthquake.

In addition to structural damage caused by groundshaking, there are other ground effects caused by such shaking. These ***ground failure*** effects include liquefaction, subsidence, lurch cracking, and lateral spreading. *Liquefaction* in soils and sediments can occur during earthquake events, when material is temporarily transformed from a solid to a liquid (gelatinous) by increases in interpore pressure. Earthquake-induced liquefaction most often occurs in low-lying areas with soils composed of unconsolidated, saturated, clay-free sands and silts, but can also occur in dry, granular soils or saturated soils with some clay content. Liquefaction also occurs in areas overlain by unconsolidated fill, particularly artificial fill.

The presence of several unconsolidated and saturated soils throughout the area indicates a moderate liquefaction potential, particularly on the alluvial soils found along the low-lying ravines and creeks.

Subsidence is the compaction of soils and alluvium caused by groundshaking. It occurs irregularly and is largely a function of the underlying soils. Depending on the event, the amount of compaction can vary from a few inches to several feet. In Loomis, the potential for subsidence is greatest in areas underlain by alluvium or other soft water-saturated soils. However, no significant subsidence problems have been identified in the planning area by published environmental documents.

Lurch cracking refers to fractures, cracks and fissures produced by groundshaking, and may occur far from an earthquake's epicenter. Lateral spreading is the horizontal movement of soil toward an open face of a stream bank or the side of a levee. Steep-sided artificial fill embankments are most susceptible to damage. The potential for these hazards is greatest on steep-sided alluvial soils where the groundwater table is high. In Loomis, this would include areas adjacent to Antelope Creek, Secret Ravine, and Sucker Ravine.

Other Geologic Hazards. *Landslides* may be triggered by oversaturated soils (after heavy rains) or by earthquakes. Landslide potential is highest in steeply-sloped areas, particularly those areas underlain with saturated and unconsolidated soil. The steepest slopes in Loomis are those west of Antelope Creek, just west of Sierra College Boulevard. Some slopes exceed 30% in this area. However, the underlying geology of the area is generally mehrten volcanics and granite, solid foundation materials not highly susceptible to landslides. The southeasternmost portion of the planning area also exhibits locally steep slopes (15-25% slopes are common). Again, the underlying materials are typically stable volcanics or granite, and landslide potential

would be minimized to some extent. Most other portions of Loomis are relatively level or gently sloping, and thus not highly susceptible to landslides.

Soils in the planning area, some of which are on steep slopes and are loosely textured, generally exhibit moderate *erosion* potential, particularly when exposed on embankment faces and slopes. The effects of erosion range from nuisance problems, such as increased siltation in storm drains, to extreme cases where watercourses are downcut and gullies develop that can eventually undermine adjacent structures or vegetation.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. A project will normally result in significant geological impacts if it would:

- *Expose people or structures to major geologic hazards;*
- *Cause a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.*

As a General Plan Update, impacts must be evaluated somewhat differently. The General Plan Update provides policy direction that tends to mitigate potential impacts of individual developments. This analysis will be conducted in that context.

Key Issues. The following key environmental issues related geologic hazards were identified during the preparation of the proposed General Plan. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan.

- *The rural nature of the community and presence of older structures increases the Town's risk from seismic and geologic seismic and urban-interface fire hazards.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issues identified, the following are considered potentially significant geological impacts by the community:

- Alteration of topography during construction
- Exposure of lives or property associated with new development to geologic hazards

Construction that could occur in the future in accordance with the Land Use Element may require excavation and grading. Such activities could change the topographic relief in some portions of the Town, and could also result in compaction, displacement, and other disruption of the soil. Development could result in localized wind or water erosion of soils, or contribute to adverse impacts from additional permeability and runoff.

The General Plan Update has been developed to recognize the geologic conditions in the Town. Its policies will control the density and type of development permitted in areas with identified geologic constraints. Throughout the Town, seismic and geologic hazards occur. These constraints will need to be considered when development is planned in potentially hazardous areas.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. Various General Plan Update policies would determine the appropriate intensities of development for different parts of the planning area to avoid substantial topographical alteration. Individual projects will be reviewed for specific impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. The Public Health and Safety Element includes a number of policies to minimize geologic hazards relating to new development in the Town. These include:

- **Policy PH&SE 2.** Engineering analysis of new development proposals shall be required in areas with possible soil instability, flooding, earthquake faults, or other hazards, and prohibit development in high danger areas.

- **Policy PH&SE 3.** Loomis shall comply with Placer County's Emergency Response Plan, as well as revise the Town Emergency Plan to address Town-specific issues.

- **Policy PH&SE 6.** Loomis shall cooperate with Federal, State, and local authorities to ensure that loss due to seismic activity and other natural and man-made disasters is minimized.

- **Policy PH&SE 7.** Loomis shall encourage compliance with State requirements for unreinforced masonry buildings and seismic safety.

In addition, the following General Plan Update implementation measures would further mitigate potential impacts:

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 2.** The Town shall identify and inventory its unreinforced masonry buildings.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 3.** The Town should implement a program of retrofitting existing unreinforced masonry buildings.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 5.** The highest and most current professional standards for seismic design shall be used in the design of Critical, Sensitive and High-Occupancy Facilities, so that the seismic design of the facilities will not become substandard within a few years.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 6.** The Town engineer shall establish a central repository for the collection and compilation of geologic and soils engineering information related to faults and fault zone studies, groundwater levels, soils characteristics, susceptibility to landslides and liquefaction, and other data as appropriate.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 10.** The Town should monitor bridges, over and underpasses, and walls in the public right-of-way to ensure safety.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 11.** The Town shall require, prior to approval of a project located in an area subject to potential seismic hazards (liquefaction, fault

rupture, landslides, etc.), a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 12.** The Town shall develop standards and restrictions such as the limits on the types of allowable development, development intensity/density standards, and subdivision design policies for sites subject to seismically-induced landslides or liquefaction, or potential fault rupture areas for identified active and potentially active faults.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 21.** Emergency preparedness exercises should be conducted at least once every two years.

No further policy-related mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these Public Health and Safety Element policies and implementation measures is anticipated to fully mitigate impacts relating to geologic hazards. No additional mitigation is required. Individual projects, as they are developed, will be subject to geotechnical review, where appropriate, and will implement site-specific mitigation.

3.6 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Setting

The Draft Safety Element provides information on potential risks to public safety from hazardous materials used or transported through the Loomis area. This information is summarized below.

Household Products. By far the most common hazardous materials are those found or used in the home. Waste oil is a common hazardous material that is often improperly disposed of and can contaminate surface water through runoff. Other household hazardous wastes (used paint, pesticides, cleaning products and other chemicals) are common and often improperly stored in garages and homes throughout the community. Because of their prevalence and proximity to residents, household products constitute the most pervasive health hazard facing residents of the community.

Industrial Products. More than 60,000 chemicals are produced in the United States. Over 11,000 of these chemicals are used for commercial purposes. Within the Town of Loomis, over 5,000 manufacturing and service industries use or store hazardous materials, including pesticides, acids, caustics, solvents, plastics and heavy metals.

Under Chapter 6.95, section 25503 of the California Health and Safety Code, Business Plans are required from California businesses that handle a hazardous material in quantities equal to or greater than the following:

- *55 gallons of a liquid;*
- *500 pounds of a solid;*
- *200 cubic feet of a compressed gas; or*
- *Extremely hazardous substances above Federal threshold reporting quantities*

As part of the Business Plan, emergency response plans and procedures must be developed and training sessions must be provided to employees. Businesses are periodically inspected by local administering agencies to ensure that handling, storage, and waste disposal practices conform with appropriate laws and regulations.

Many businesses commonly use or store hazardous materials, including gasoline stations, automotive repair facilities, dry cleaners, agricultural facilities, and miscellaneous commercial and industrial facilities. Industrial use of hazardous materials is centered in the downtown area, particularly along Taylor Road. Specific information regarding the location of businesses and types and quantities of hazardous substances used or stored can be obtained through the Fire Department or Environmental Health Department.

Mine Tailings. Historic mining operations often left dredge tailings, or discarded rock and material, either near the mine site in the case of dredge or hardrock mining, or washed downstream as a result of upstream hydraulic mining. Dredge mining was common in the 19th century along the creeks in the Loomis area, and dredge tailings can still be found. Hydraulic operations have scarred hillsides in Loomis, one notable example being on the proposed Loomis

Hills Estates development site, where a 60-foot high, 1,000-foot long cliff provides evidence of such operations (Town of Loomis, *Sherwood Park Draft EIR*, 1998).

Mine tailings can be contaminated with mercury or cyanide, both of which are used in the process of gold refining. However, most gold was not refined in the immediate Loomis area and the potential for such contamination in dredge materials is considered low.

Agricultural Pesticide Use. Loomis includes many agricultural operations. Orchards in particular are often sprayed with various pesticides, which can contaminate the soils. Denuded vegetation can suggest evidence for soil contamination. Potential contaminants can include DDT, lead and arsenic. In such areas, it is prudent to conduct soil testing (and conducting soil clean-up steps, if necessary) before allowing more intensive development. In the downtown area, some structures were formerly used for agricultural purposes.

Asbestos. Asbestos is a highly crumbly material often found in older buildings, typically used as insulation in walls or ceilings. It was formerly popular as an insulating material because it had the desirable characteristic of being fire resistant. However, it can pose a health risk when very small particles become airborne. These dust-like particles can be easily inhaled, where their microscopically sharp structures can puncture tiny air sacs in the lungs, resulting in long-term health problems.

Loomis contains many older structures with the potential to contain asbestos. Pre-1979 construction often included asbestos and it should be assumed that the demolition of older structures in the Town may present this hazard. Proper asbestos abatement and disposal procedures should be undertaken whenever the demolition of older structures is considered.

Hazardous Materials Transport. The Union Pacific Railroad and Interstate 80 are major transcontinental transportation routes that pass through Loomis. Trains and trucks commonly carry a variety of hazardous materials, including gasoline and various crude oil derivatives, and other chemicals known to cause human health problems. When properly contained, these materials present no hazard to the community. But in the event of an accident or derailment, such materials may be released, either in liquid or gas form. In the case of some chemicals (such as chlorine), highly toxic fumes may be carried far by air or water from the accident site.

Although standard accident and hazardous materials recovery procedures are enforced by the state and followed by private transportation companies, the Town of Loomis is at relatively high risk because of its location along interstate rail and highway corridors. In addition, the relatively low overhead clearance for the freeway bridges in the Town pose an additional risk for trucks transporting hazardous materials, which is a primary reason why some trucks divert from the freeway and travel through the Town on Taylor Road.

Hazardous Waste Management. Counties are required by state law to prepare hazardous waste management plans. Placer County's Plan addresses the treatment, storage and disposal of such materials. The primary goal of the plan is to protect public health by promoting the safe use and disposal of hazardous waste. To accomplish this, the plan provides for the reduction of hazardous waste through source reduction, recycling, and on-site handling

and treatment methods. Public education and community involvement are key features for achieving this goal.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. A significant impact with respect to hazardous materials would occur when development would use or reuse the site of an activity that has historically stored or used hazardous materials.

Key Issues. Although there are no identified key issues related to hazardous materials in the Draft General Plan, it is a goal of the Public Health and Safety Element to "*reduce risks associated with natural and man-made hazards through compliance with State and Federal safety programs*." This is the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan Update.

Potential Impacts. Based on the identified goals of the General Plan Update, the following are considered potentially significant impacts by the community:

- The exposure of lives or property to hazardous materials from various land uses, including industry that uses hazardous materials;
- Exposure to lives or property to risks associated with the transport of such materials.

Development that would be accommodated under the Draft General Plan would have the potential to increase risks associated with hazardous material use and transport in two ways. First, buildout of the community as allowed under the Land Use and Community Design Element would increase the Townwide population by about 70%. Thus, there would be an overall increase in potential exposure to hazards associated with existing facilities. Second, although the General Plan Update is not anticipated to accommodate new large industrial facilities, the general increase in commercial and light industrial activity in the community would incrementally increase the use of potentially hazardous materials. Therefore, the overall potential for accidental spills would be expected to increase to some degree.

As individual development are proposed, the Fire Prevention Inspector responsible for the project will review lists of hazardous materials provided by the applicant as part of the project description to determine consistency with the State Health and Safety Code. A site visit may be necessary to determine compatibility to surrounding areas. Whether the hazardous material impacts of a project are significant shall be decided on a case-by-case basis and depends on:

- *Individual or cumulative physical hazard of material or materials.*
- *Amounts of materials onsite, either in use or storage.*
- *Proximity of hazardous materials to populated areas and compatibility of materials with neighboring facilities.*
- *Federal, State, and local laws, and ordinances, governing storage and use of hazardous materials.*
- *Potential for spill or release.*

- *Proximity of hazardous materials to receiving waters or other significant environmental resource.*

In addition, the storage, handling and disposal of potentially hazardous waste must be in conformance with the requirements set forth in the following regulations:

- *Enabling Legislation – California Administrative Code, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 30.*
- *California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5.*

Interstate 80, Taylor Road and the Union Pacific Railroad are used as corridors to transport hazardous materials through the community. The risk of upset associated with spills from trucks or trains are considered low, and the General Plan Update includes policies, that if implemented, would minimize impacts to the extent possible. However, the Town has little control over the nature and frequency of hazardous materials traversing the community on these rights-of-way, which are regulated by the state. Accidents could occur, and the Town would be adversely affected by it regardless of any General Plan Update policies that would provide potential mitigation. Impacts are considered to be unlikely, but potentially significant.

Traffic accidents involving large trucks or trains hauling hazardous materials could result in a public safety hazard. In addition to traffic related incidents, hazardous materials spills could be caused by ground shaking associated with a large earthquake or other soil related hazards (landslide, debris flow, liquefaction, etc.). Hazardous material containers not properly secured could be felled and/or ruptured. Improperly segregated materials could result in toxic or explosive reactions.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The following policies, as outlined in the Draft Public Health and Safety Element, are specifically intended to address risks relating to hazardous materials use, storage and transportation:

- **Policy PH&SE 3.** Loomis shall comply with Placer County's Emergency Response Plan, as well as revise the Town Emergency Plan to address Town-specific issues.

- **Policy PH&SE 8.** Loomis shall continue to train and equip Town personnel to cope with emergency disaster situations, including hazardous material incidents.

- **Policy PH&SE 11.** Town policies concerning the use, storage and transportation of hazardous materials, and regarding underground or above ground storage tanks, should reflect the Placer County Environmental Health Division and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board policies and requirements.

In addition, the following implementation measures would further address hazardous materials issues:

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 1.** Loomis shall revise its Town Emergency Plan every five years.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 19.** All discretionary project applications shall include information involving the proposed use and amounts of, storage, handling, transport and/or disposal of hazardous materials/wastes and any previous use, storage, handling and/or disposal of hazardous materials/wastes.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 20.** The Town shall develop a list of land uses or businesses that typically use, store or generate hazardous materials/wastes, to be used as a screening tool during the environmental review process.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 21.** Emergency preparedness exercises should be conducted at least once every two years. Exercises shall be designed to test and upgrade disaster response plans. Disaster planning scenarios and emergency response plans shall include contingencies for: [among other issues] a major release of hazardous materials from a simulated road or rail accident.

These measures would generally be expected to minimize impacts related to hazardous materials. However, it is recommended that the following policies be added to provide further direction for processing projects in areas where hazardous materials could be an issue:

- **Additional Policy HM-1.** As individual developments are proposed, the Environmental Health specialist responsible for the project will review lists of hazardous materials provided by the applicant as part of the project description to determine consistency with the State Health and Safety Code. A site visit may be necessary to determine compatibility to surrounding areas. Whether the hazardous material impacts of a project are significant shall be decided on a case-by-case basis and depends on:
    - *Individual or cumulative physical hazard of material or materials.*
    - *Amounts of materials onsite, either in use or storage.*
    - *Proximity of hazardous materials to populated areas and compatibility of materials with neighboring facilities.*
    - *Federal, State, and local laws, and ordinances, governing storage and use of hazardous materials.*
    - *Potential for spill or release.*
    - *Proximity of hazardous materials to receiving waters or other significant environmental resource.*

- **Additional Policy HM-2.** The storage, handling and disposal of potentially hazardous waste must be in conformance with the requirements set forth in the following regulations:
    - *Enabling Legislation – California Administrative Code, Title 22, Division 4, Ch. 30.*
    - *California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5.*

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these policies would reduce risks associated with hazardous materials use to the extent possible. However, there is little the Town can do to avoid impacts from hazardous materials that are transported through the community. Consequently, impacts from the

regional transport of hazardous materials source are considered significant and unavoidable. Potential risks associated with specific facilities involving the use of hazardous materials that are proposed in the community in the future would be subject to separate environmental review.

3.7 HYDROLOGY (Flood Hazard and Water Resources)

Setting

The following summarizes the potential flood conditions and water resources in the Loomis planning area.

Water Resources. Most of the Town of Loomis is supplied by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). However, some of the more rural portions of the planning area are not connected to the PCWA's infrastructure, and are supplied by private wells. Each source of water is described in greater detail below.

Placer County Water Agency. The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) provides domestic water service throughout Placer County, including the Loomis community. The Agency's water supplies include 125,000 acre-feet of water per year (AFY) from the Yuba-Bear River watershed and 120,000 AFY from the Middle Fork of the American and Rubicon rivers. An additional 117,000 AFY can be purchased from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Service Area. Loomis is within PCWA's Zone 1 service area, which also extends from as far north and east as Auburn, west to Lincoln, and south to Granite Bay. PCWA operates five water treatment plants in Zone 1: the Auburn, Bowman and Newcastle treatment plants serve the upper portion of Zone 1, while the Foothill and Sunset plants serve the lower portion of the service area.

Distribution and Storage Facilities. The Foothill/Sunset water treatment system provides the required water treatment for the domestic water supplied to the Loomis community, as well as some adjacent areas. The treatment capacity is 32 million gallons per day (mgd), which is sufficient to serve the present needs of its service area (about 7,500 connections). In 1999, the maximum day demand was about 30 mgd. However, the Agency's current outstanding commitment for treated water service, including already paid connections in the Foothill/Sunset system, is 35.5 mgd.

To accommodate this demand, the PCWA is currently expanding the Foothill Water treatment Plant by 28 mgd, which will increase the overall capacity in the system to 60 mgd. The first phase of improvements, upgrading Foothill's filter system, will yield up to 8 mgd of increased capacity prior to summer 2001. Completion of the project is expected in 2002. The PCWA does not anticipate any limitations in service during that time.

In May 1998, under Resolution 98-23, the Board of Directors reserved 6,000 acre feet of water to serve up to 8 mgd of new demand from the Foothill WTP expansion and 2.5 mgd of new demand within the Auburn-Bowman system, until completion of a permanent, 35,500 acre foot capacity American River Pump Station. The Agency estimates that approximately 4,200 acre feet of that reserved water supply remains un-requested as of the date of this letter.

With the completion of a permanent American River Pump Station, the Agency will be able to commit to a firm supply of agricultural water and supply the remaining 20 mgd of treatment capacity available from the Foothill Water Treatment Plant expansion. The PCWA estimates that at the current rate of growth of communities within its service area, it will take a out 10 years for the Foothill WTP expansion capacity to be fully utilized (see PCWA's response to NOP). The ability to serve additional projects would largely be the function of the reservation capacity by others through the payment of PERC.

The PCWA's current plan is to further expand the availability of treated water for development in western Placer County through the planned diversion and treatment of 35,000 are feet of water from the Sacramento River. With this source, the PCWA anticipates it will be able to serve its subscriber's needs including those of Loomis, through 2030. However, obtaining Sacramento River water would first entail an environmental review and permitting process, and is likely to include the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan for much of western Placer County.

Water reaches the Foothill Water Treatment Plant from two conduits: PG&E's South Canal is the main source, while the PCWA's Boardman Canal is a secondary source. The water is stored in two reservoirs, the Penryn Tank in Penryn and Mammoth Reservoir between King and Horseshoe Bar roads. Both are located outside the planning area. The Penryn Tank stores about 1 million gallons of treated water, while Mammoth Reservoir stores canal water.

The Cross-Basin Pipeline is planned to eventually connect the Foothill Water Treatment Plant to the Sunset Water Treatment Plant, ultimately providing additional service to Loomis and the areas north and east of Loomis. Phases I and II of the Cross Basin Pipeline were recently completed and are currently in service.

Residential, commercial and industrial customers in the Town receive water service by feeder lines that branch from a 24-inch main running along the Union Pacific Railroad corridor on the west side of Taylor Road. The primary north-south main in the community is a 12-inch pipeline along Laird Road.

The PCWA is in the final stages of design on the Penryn Lincoln Sunset Pipeline. When complete, this 42/30 inch pipeline will provide needed transmission capacity from the Foothill WTP to Lincoln, Rocklin, Loomis and portions of the unincorporated County. The agency anticipates completion of this pipeline prior to the summer of 2002,

System Deficiencies. PCWA's Zone 1 Water System Master Plan identifies no major problems with the distribution system in the planning area. Several performance deficiencies, such as high velocity in the pipes passing through Penryn and low velocity in the pipes near Horseshoe Bar, will be resolved when a pipeline is installed from Penryn to Sunset, an action that is expected to be completed in 2002 (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan Draft EIR*, 1993; PCWA, NOP response letter, January 2000).

Groundwater (Private Wells). Portions of the Loomis community do not have access to the PCWA's distribution system and are supplied by private wells. The rural residential properties along Barton Road are within the largest area in Loomis not served by the PCWA. Groundwater distribution in the planning area is sporadic and well yield is highly variable. Water quality varies with the source. Granitic rock wells provide the best water quality in the area and many of the area's wells are of this type. Wells overlying alluvial deposits vary from low to moderate quality. Many wells in the area experience iron and manganese contamination, sometimes associated with low yield.

Groundwater Characteristics. The Loomis planning area overlies a portion of the Placer County Hydrologic Basin, as defined by the California Department of Water Resources. Groundwater yield within this basin is sporadic and highly variable. Individual wells may demonstrate sufficient yields, while nearby wells may show almost no yield (Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan Draft EIR, 1993). Groundwater in sufficient quantity to supply domestic requirements occurs only in small openings along bedrock fractures. Wells within alluvial Terrace deposits are unreliable and subject to surface contamination. During recharge by winter rains, water tables rise up to near the surface, where the quality of groundwater decreases as it intercepts septic tank leach zones.

Well depths typically range from 50 to 150 feet below the surface, with the most common depth of encountering water within granitic rocks being between 60 and 70 feet. The average production for granitic rock wells in the planning area is 4 to 9 gallons per minute. (*Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan Draft EIR*, 1993). Although few comprehensive groundwater studies within the planning area are available, groundwater depth is known to be highly variable. For example, groundwater depth in the southeastern portion of the planning area is estimated to be in the range of 300 feet below the surface (Town of Loomis, *Sherwood Park Draft EIR*, 1998).

There has been no recent hydrogeologic evaluation of available groundwater supplies within the underlying basin. Livingston (1974) estimated the volume of available groundwater to be between 40 and 200 million gallons per day.

Water Quality. Virtually no data on streamflow and water quality for streams in the planning area were found in a review of local, state, and federal agency records. Limited water quality data, however, are available from PCWA for its canal and water distribution system. Although the source of PCWA's water is outside the planning area, a portion of the canal system flows through the area. Test results show that contaminants levels of inflow into the canal distribution system are consistently below maximum allowable levels, except those of coliform bacteria, which fluctuate with the time of year (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan Draft EIR*, 1993).

The primary sources of pollution to surface and groundwater resources include stormwater runoff from paved areas, which can contain hydrocarbons, sediments, pesticides, herbicides, toxic metals, and coliform bacteria. Improperly placed septic tank leach fields can cause similar types of contamination. Illegal waste dumping can introduce contaminants such as gasoline, pesticides, herbicides and other harmful chemicals. The County Environmental Health Department regulates water quality, and can require spot tests of wells at any time to monitor

for contaminants. While no detailed study has been performed, several shallow wells have shown high nitrate concentrations, suggesting surface contamination.

Regulatory Framework. Development in the planning area is subject to various local, state, and federal regulations and permits regarding the use of water resources. The Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, California Department of Water Resources, and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board are the primary agencies responsible for the protection of watersheds, floodplains, and water quality. The Placer County Department of Environmental Health is the primary agency responsible for establishing design standards and permitting septic tanks and wells. The federal government administers the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which regulates discharges into surface waters. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill materials into Waters of the United States or adjacent wetlands without a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Drainage and Flood Hazard. The planning area is within the Dry Creek watershed, which covers about 101 square miles in Placer and Sacramento counties. Antelope Creek, Secret Ravine, and their tributaries are the primary drainages in the area, all of which ultimately flow into Dry Creek. Drainage characteristics of the area are described below.

FEMA 100-Year Flood Hazard. Flooding has historically been a relatively minor hazard in the Loomis area, primarily due to its relatively elevated location within the Dry Creek watershed. However, some homes have been flooded in the past during major rainfalls, primarily in areas near creeks where drainage infrastructure has become impeded, and flood waters have backed up onto adjoining properties. The lower portions of the Dry Creek watershed have historically been harder hit by flooding, particularly in the Roseville area (where tributaries of Dry Creek converge) and in the flatlands in the Rio Linda area. In addition, certain portions of the Town are subject to consistent but minor flooding, notably the portions of Antelope Creek near Saunders Avenue, Del Mar Avenue, and No Name Lane. Secret Ravine has also flooded in the recent past, affecting some neighboring properties.

The National Flood Insurance Study of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) produced the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the Town in 1998. The map identifies special flood hazard areas in the community, focusing on areas that could be inundated in the event of a 100-year flood (which statistically has a 1% chance of occurring in any given year). The map shows the locations of 100-year and 500-year flood plains in the community, which are generally along Secret Ravine, Antelope Creek, Sucker Ravine, and their tributaries. Figure 5 shows the FEMA 100-year flood zone in the community.

Figure 5. FEMA 100-Year Flood Plain
(same as Figure 7-2 in the Technical Background Report)

Local Flooding Concerns. Inadequately-sized culverts and bridges can create impediments to the passage of high water flow in streams and swales. Undersized infrastructure typically result in short-term back-ups behind the culvert or bridge, with pooling water in such areas, in effect, an unintended detention basin. Areas of potential concern in Loomis could include culverts under Interstate 80; the Horseshoe Bar Road crossing over Secret Ravine; the railroad and Taylor Road crossing of Sucker Ravine; and various crossings of Antelope Creek and its tributaries, at King Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and Citrus Colony Road (north of the Town). Various culverts and storm drains throughout the Town are also subject to potential flooding in the event that they become clogged with debris during heavy rains.

The Town of Loomis Specific Plan EIR identifies drainage problems associated with the culvert under the southbound freeway ramp of Interstate 80 into a poorly maintained swale near South Walnut Street. Other similar deficiencies are likely elsewhere, most notably the Sunrise Loomis subdivision. During the heavy rain season of 1995, localized flooding was experienced on some low-lying properties near Secret Ravine and Antelope Creek, causing property damage in some cases. In general, flooding occurred because of downstream blockages within flood channels or culverts.

Flood maintenance is an ongoing problem throughout Placer County. In Loomis, many of the major drainages are located on private property, and the Town generally does not have access to conduct maintenance operations to keep channels clear of debris. There is no clear responsibility regarding maintenance of drainages on private property (Town or property owners), though newer developments are required to include easements to facilitate maintenance. Nevertheless, this does not address existing deficiencies, which are experienced throughout the community. The Town Council recently approved funding for a drainage master Plan, which would in part be intended to address local flooding concerns.

Dam Inundation. Loomis is not in the dam inundation area for any major stream or river in the region. There are no dams or reservoirs (except small local detention facilities) upstream of Loomis on any tributary of Antelope Creek or Secret Ravine. Loomis is not subject to potential damage from dam inundation.

Regulatory Framework. The Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (PCFCWCD) is responsible for developing flood control management strategies within the County, with each City or Town responsible for their implementation. The Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan (James M. Montgomery, 1992) prepared for the PCFDWCD and the Sacramento County Water Agency addresses flood control within the watershed, and suggests the following development principles:

- New development should provide on-site detention;
- Local policies should be implemented to restrict the removal of riparian vegetation along channels;
- Regional detention basins should be constructed;
- Inadequate bridges and culverts should be replaced; and
- Procedures for flood preparedness should be formulated.

The Town of Loomis Resolution 97-70 establishes an agreement between PCFCWCD and the Town to coordinate the development, support and operation of PCFCWCD facilities. Within the planning area, the Loomis Town Manager is the Town Floodplain Administrator. The PCFCWCD provides guidance to the Town in dealing with potential flooding impacts. To help implement the above principles, on-site detention that reduces runoff to 90% of existing flows is required of new development within the Dry Creek watershed.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. Hydrology impacts for projects allowed under the General Plan Update would be on considered significant if they would:

- *Increase runoff flood peaks over existing conditions; any increase in site runoff could exacerbate downstream flood-prone areas;*
- *Potentially cause a violation of state or federal water quality standards or objectives, including general narrative objectives for preventing aquatic toxicity, maintaining existing beneficial uses, and anti-degradation of state waters.*
- *Result in disturbance of existing channel banks and channel beds to the extent that short-term or long-term erosion and siltation could occur upstream or downstream;*
- *Potentially deplete surface water and ground water resources used for other beneficial uses; or*
- *Locate structures in a Federal Emergency Management Agency-approved 100-year floodplain.*

Buildout within the Town would have a significant effect to water supplies if demand exceeds the available supply, thereby causing water shortages during average or peak demand periods either within the project area or region. The project would also have a significant effect if the local water purveyor's current or proposed supply and storage facilities, such as pipelines or treatment facilities are not adequate to serve the Town.

Key Issues. The following key environmental issue related to water resource and flooding issues was identified during the preparation of the proposed General Plan Update. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan Update.

- *A number of properties and roadways along local creeks have been flooded during winter storms, despite flood preventative measures.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issue identified above, the following are considered potentially significant water resource and flooding related impacts by the community:

- Exposure of lives and property to flood hazard; and
- The potential for unreliable water quality or quantity to diminish the health and safety of the community.

Drainage. Flooding can cause widespread damage to affected areas. Buildings and vehicles can be damaged or destroyed, while smaller objects can be buried in flood-deposited sediments. Floods can also cause drowning or isolation of people or animals. In addition, floodwaters can break utility lines, interrupting services and potentially affecting health and safety, particularly in the case of broken sewer or gas lines.

The secondary effects of flooding are due to standing water, which can result in crop damage, septic tank failure, and water well contamination. Standing water can also damage roads, foundations, and electrical circuits.

Development along Secret Ravine, Antelope Creek, Sucker Ravine, or their tributaries could expose lives and property to flood risk in the event of a major flood event. In addition, further development within the planning area would be expected to increase community-wide impervious surface area, thereby increasing overall runoff into area creeks during major storms. This could increase flood potential in other parts of the planning area.

Water Quality. The continued use of septic tanks in the rural portions of the planning area may adversely affect both surface and groundwater quality. In a few cases, septic tanks in Town have failed, but there has been no enforcement because of a lack of funding, and no complaint was registered. Parts of the planning area are subject to high nitrate concentrations from overuse of septic tanks and agricultural uses. Water quality impacts are potentially significant.

Water Supply. PCWA provides water service to the Town. To accommodate this demand, the PCWA is currently expanding the Foothill Water treatment Plant by 28 mgd, which will increase the overall capacity in the system to 60 mgd. The first phase of improvements, upgrading Foothill's filter system, will yield up to 8 mgd of increased capacity prior to summer 2001. Completion of the project is expected in 2002. The PCWA does not anticipate any limitations in service during that time.

The PCWA's current plan is to further expand the availability of treated water for development in western Placer County through the planned diversion and treatment of 35,000 are feet of water from the Sacramento River. With this source, the PCWA anticipates it will be able to serve its subscriber's needs including those of Loomis, through 2030. However, obtaining Sacramento River water would first entail an environmental review and permitting process, and is likely to include the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan for much of western Placer County.

The PCWA is in the final stages of design on the Penryn Lincoln Sunset Pipeline. When complete, this 42/30 inch pipeline will provide needed transmission capacity from the Foothill WTP to Lincoln, Rocklin, Loomis and portions of the unincorporated County. The agency anticipates completion of this pipeline prior to the summer of 2002.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. Various General Plan Update policies would determine the appropriate intensities of development for different parts of the planning area to minimize flood risk. The Public Health and Safety Element includes a number of policies to minimize flood hazard and problems related to water quality. These include:

- **Policy PH&SE 3.** Loomis shall comply with Placer County's Emergency Response Plan, as well as revise the Town Emergency Plan to address Town-specific issues.

- **Policy PH&SE 4.** New development shall be prohibited in the 100-year flood zone as determined by FEMA and FIRM maps.

- **Policy PH&SE 5.** New development near stream channels shall be designed so that reduced stream capacity, stream bank erosion, or adverse impacts on habitat values are avoided.

In addition, the following General Plan Update implementation measures would further mitigate potential impacts:

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 1.** Loomis shall revise its Town Emergency Plan every five years.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 8.** The Town shall work with property owners to maintain floodways critical to the safety of neighboring properties.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 9.** The Town engineer shall develop a hazards map of the town, with sufficient detail to be useful for engineering purposes.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 10.** The Town should monitor bridges, over and underpasses, and walls in the public right-of-way to ensure safety.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 13.** The Town shall develop standards and restrictions within identified floodplains or areas subject to inundation by a 100-year flood. These might include subdivision design, setback requirements, and development intensity/density standards.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 14.** The Town should work with property owners to clear chronically debris-clogged culverts and channels on an annual basis to minimize upstream flooding potential.

- **Implementation Measure PH&SE 21.** Emergency preparedness exercises should be conducted at least once every two years. Exercises shall be designed to test and upgrade disaster response plans. Disaster planning scenarios and emergency response plans shall include contingencies for [among other issues] a major flood event.

These policies and implementation measures would reduce flood and water resource related impacts. In addition, the following new policies shall be added:

- **Additional Policy H-1.** Further channelization and/or banking of creeks or streams within the planning area shall be discouraged, unless no other alternative is available to minimize flood risk. Setbacks from flood sources shall be the preferred method of avoiding impacts.

- **Additional Policy H-2.** Site-specific recommendations of the Town's Drainage Master Plan, upon completion, shall be applied to individual development projects as appropriate.

In addition, **Implementation Measure PH&SE 13** should be reworded to address standards in areas that are potentially inundated by floods, rather than specific impacts within the 100-year flood zone. As noted in **Policy PH&SE 4**, development is prohibited in the 100-year flood zone. The change in the implementation measure is necessary to remove a potential contradiction.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these Public Health and Safety Element policies and implementation measures, in addition to the recommended policy, is anticipated to fully mitigate impacts relating to flood hazards. Water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of proposed policies, in conjunction with NPDES requirements applied to individual projects. Provided that anticipated facilities expansions are completed, impacts related to water supply would be reduced to a less than significant level. Otherwise, impacts are potentially significant and unavoidable.

3.8 LAND USE

Setting

Existing land uses in the Loomis Planning Area are discussed in the Draft Land Use Element and Technical Background Report for the General Plan Update, available for public review and incorporated by reference. Land Use conditions in the town are also summarized in Section 2.0 of this EIR, *Project Description* (see Figures 1 and 2). In summary, the following relevant land use conditions and issues exist in the Town:

Community Character. The Town of Loomis is characterized by a village-style core containing a historical, small-scale downtown, surrounded by medium-density housing and some light industry, with much lower density rural residential areas beyond. Under the proposed General Plan Update, this historical arrangement of land uses would be maintained. Higher-intensity uses are intended to be concentrated adjacent to the downtown and adjacent to Interstate 80 (I-80), with the land uses in surrounding areas becoming progressively less intense (and with lower residential densities) as the distance from the core increases.

Land Use Designations and Distribution. Loomis is divided into land use designations that reflect its largely rural residential character. Please refer to Table 1 in Section 2.0 for a summary of these designations, with proposed distribution by acreage. The Project Description also discusses the location of land uses, and areas where changes are proposed to occur from the existing plan. Also please refer to the draft Land Use Map, which was prepared for the Draft Land Use Element.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. According to the CEQA Guidelines, a project can result in adverse environmental impacts relating to land use it is has the potential to substantially alter the existing or planned land use of an area. This standard is somewhat inappropriate for a General Plan update, since updates, by definition, would result in a change of land use. Furthermore, the land use changes resulting from revision of general plans are typically manifest in secondary impacts, such as air quality and traffic. The significance thresholds, therefore, are based on land use compatibility, as defined in the discussion of the publicly-identified key issues below.

Key Issues. The following key environmental issues related to potential land use conflicts were identified during the preparation of the proposed General Plan Update. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan Update.

- *Increased urbanization in adjacent communities is threatening to encroach upon the open space and agricultural areas in and surrounding Loomis.*

- *Development pressures suggest that Loomis consider rezoning some of its agricultural/residential land to increase land and infrastructure efficiency. However, residents have expressed their preference for the retention of large lot, rural residential parcels.*

- *Sierra College Boulevard is becoming an important regional circulation route, and may be appropriate for more intensive land uses. However, Town residents have indicated strong support for concentration of more intensive land uses in the traditional downtown core area.*

- *Size restrictions need to be placed on secondary residential units allowed on agricultural and rural residential lots in Loomis.*

- *Traffic increases, particularly on regionally important routes, could lead to future land use incompatibilities.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issues identified, the following are considered potentially significant land use impacts by the community:

- Land use incompatibility between residences and industrial uses;
- Incompatibility between rural character and second residential units
- Encroachment and conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses;
- Access to new commercial and industrial areas could adversely affect residences;

Based on the proposed land use plan, potential incompatibilities could occur at the following locations:

- West of Swetzer Road (industrial/residential interface);
- North of Brace Road (commercial/residential interface)
- Along Secret Ravine, south of I-80 (commercial/residential interface)
- Sierra College Boulevard, near Bankhead Road (commercial/residential interface)
- Along Taylor Road (commercial/industrial/residential interface)

The magnitude of future impacts at these locations is not known, but based on known residential complaints regarding noise, light, and traffic at these locations, it is reasonable to expect future impacts are possible. Such impacts must be considered potentially significant. Please refer to the discussion of traffic, noise and air quality for further discussion of compatibility issues.

Impacts to agricultural resources are discussed in the Initial Study for this project, and are not expected to be significant. No active commercially cultivated agricultural lands are intended for redesignation to urban use.

Access to commercial development could pose land use impacts, most notably associated with the commercial development site at I-80/Horseshoe Bar Road and other possible commercial uses south of I-80. Commercial development would potentially front on residential uses along Brace Road, and increased traffic along this roadway could lead to potentially significant land use impacts.

The potential land use impacts associated with the various land use changes contemplated under the proposed General Plan Update are summarized in Table LU-1. The map identifiers shown in the table refer to those shown in Figure 10 within Section 5.0 Alternatives. Figure 3 in the Project Description also shows these areas in more detail.

Table LU-1. Summary of Potential Impacts of Land Use Redesignations

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
A	Create commercial nodes on Sierra College Blvd. at King Road and Bankhead (from Residential Estate).	**Purpose of Change:** These changes are proposed because it may be inappropriate to locate residential uses along the most heavily traveled portion of a major roadway. Commercial uses could buffer residents from Sierra College Blvd. **Land Use Impacts:** *Possible conflicts at interface of adjacent residential uses and proposed commercial node.*
C	Change from Residential Estate to Office Professional	**Purpose of Change:** Proximity to I-80 makes this parcel potentially inappropriate for residential use. **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated.*
D	Change from Neighborhood Commercial to General Commercial	**Purpose of Change:** Redesignation provides additional flexibility on the site, which is bounded by I-80 and possibly more suited for general commercial use. **Land Use Impacts:** *Possible conflicts at interface of adjacent residential uses along Silver Ranch Avenue to the west.*
E	Change all parcels between I-80 and Secret Ravine from Residential Rural to General Commercial, with policies requiring planned development	**Purpose of Change:** The area may be more suited to commercial use because of its proximity to I-80, and could act as the Town's future regionally serving commercial center. **Land Use Impacts:** *Possible conflicts at interface of adjacent residential uses to the south and east across Secret Ravine and Brace Road. Impacts are potentially substantial, which is the reason many proposed policies address development restrictions in this area.*
F	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre, with specific policies	**Purpose of Change:** This area is located adjacent to development in Rocklin, as well as the St. Francis Woods development in Loomis, which has the same density. It is a logical area to transition from the urban densities to the west in Rocklin, and the rural development along Barton Road in Loomis. With policies to ensure clustering of units along the Rocklin side, and appropriate setbacks and landscaping on the Loomis frontages, this change would reduce potential land use conflicts in the area. **Land Use Impacts:** *Increases residential potential, possibly resulting in increased land use impacts related to traffic and noise. Specific policies are intended to address these impacts.*
H	Change Planned Development to General Commercial, just east of downtown core	**Purpose of Change:** This area provides commercial development opportunities that could round out the downtown core. **Land Use Impacts:** *Could conflict with adjacent residential uses to the north, along Laird Street. The General Plan suggests buffering with low-profile offices along this interface, with specific design objectives..*
I	Allow some office along with the General Commercial, just north of I-80	**Purpose of Change:** This area provides commercial development opportunities that could round out the downtown core. **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated. Office uses would allow a better interface with residential uses to the north.*
J	Change from Residential Estate to Business Park, just north of I-80, east of Sierra College Blvd.	**Purpose of Change:** This area provides commercial development opportunities that could round out the downtown core. **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated. Office uses would allow a better interface with residential uses to the north.*
K	Change from Residential Low Density (1 acre) to ½-acre minimum, along Mareta Road	**Purpose of Change:** This is to reflect the existing development at this built out subdivision along Mareta Road. **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated. Reflects an existing condition.*

Table LU-1. Summary of Potential Impacts of Land Use Redesignations

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
L	Change from General Commercial to Office, at corner of Taylor and King Road	**Purpose of Change:** Allows for better transition to adjacent residential uses. **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated..*
A, 13, 33	Calls for residential area to increase density from 4.6 acre minimum to 2.3 acre minimum, along Bankhead, south of Sierra College Boulevard	**Purpose of Change:** This area is intended to provide higher densities for development. **Land Use Impacts:** *Several land use conflicts are likely. Higher densities adjacent otI-80, commercial, and Sierra College Boulevard may be inappropriate. Lower densities are recommended as mitigation.*
none	Change from Industrial to Limited industrial, along Swetzer Road, north of King Road	**Purpose of Change:** Less intensive industrial uses would limit potential land use conflicts with residential uses to the west, particularly along Kathy Way **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated. Would represent a lessening of impacts compared to the existing condition*
none	Change from Shopping Center to General Commercial, at two locations near I-80. One is adjacent to Horseshoe Bar Road, the other next to Sierra College Boulevard	**Purpose of Change:** Reflects consolidation of designations proposed, and provides clarity for commercial development standards intensive industrial uses would limit potential land use conflicts with residential uses to the west, particularly along Kathy Way **Land Use Impacts:** *None anticipated. Reflects existing condition.*

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The proposed General Plan Update establishes a planned land use pattern and long-range policies to guide growth within the Town corporate boundary, which is the same as its Sphere of Influence. These policies, to be implemented by a series of implementation measures, are intended to preserve and enhance the quality of the community through methods that are both environmentally sound and equitable to all citizens of the Town.

The General Plan land use designations guide the general distribution, location, and extent of the various types of land uses in the Town. Proposed land use designations will allow for the conversion of undeveloped or vacant land to urban uses. The plan also allows for buildout of existing Town lands. The physical arrangement of established communities would not be disrupted or divided; however, changes in land uses within the Town will result from implementation of the General Plan Update. The following Draft Land Use Element policies address potential impacts related to the key issues described above:

- **Policy LUE C.1.** Loomis shall allow property owners the "right-to-farm" their parcels through the protection and operation of agricultural land uses.

- **Policy LUE C.3.** Loomis shall use zoning designations to protect properties used for agricultural operations from encroachment by urban development.

- **Policy LUE D.9.** Multi-family residential areas shall be designed to be compatible with nearby single family residential neighborhoods in terms of height and massing, and overall design. Multi-family residential development shall not be permitted on arterials serving as entryways to the Town unless substantial setbacks and landscaping are provided.

- **Policy LUE D. (second residential units).** The General Plan Update contains policies limiting the size and distribution of second residential units.

- **Policy LUE E.9.** Loomis shall not allow new industrial uses that will adversely impact either the environment or surrounding land uses.

- **Policy LUE F.3.** This policy relates to the proposed Business Park designation northeast of Sierra College Boulevard and Taylor Road. According to the policy, "*Access shall be limited to the extension of Swetzer Road; no access shall be allowed through the residentially-designated areas to the north and west.*" Further, "*proposed development shall be separated from the north and west property lines by a buffer of dense landscaping at least 50 feet in width. Development adjacent to the buffer shall be limited to low-profile, one-story structures. Parking areas shall be separated from the buffer by buildings. No outdoor storage or business activity areas shall be allowed, except for outdoor seating, eating and recreation areas for employees.*"

- **Policy LUE F.4.** This policy relates to the proposed General Commercial designation along I-80 between the Raley's Center and King Road. According to the policy, "*proposed development shall be planned to provide a gradual transition of intensity between development adjacent to I-80 and the existing residential areas to the north, to minimize the potential for land use conflicts with residential uses, and problems for residents. These sites should be developed with a mixture of land uses consisting of three tiers: general commercial and/or office uses should be located adjacent to I-80; low profile office structures should be placed in a second tier away from I-80 after the commercial uses; and medium- to medium-high density residential should be located adjacent to the existing residential areas to the north of these sites.*"

- **Policy LUE F.5.** This policy relates to the proposed Commercial south of I-80. According to the policy, "*primary access to commercial development shall be from Horseshoe Bar Road, with no more than one secondary access point on Brace Road. The secondary access shall be designed to appear as a "country road" intersection, with limited night lighting, no commercial signage (other than unlighted identification of access to the commercial sites), and the retention and enhancement of natural vegetation to screen and soften the appearance of commercial development from Brace Road, consistent with safe visibility for drivers and pedestrians.*"

- **Policy LUE F.7.** This policy relates to the proposed General Commercial designation on Taylor Road Northwest of Sierra College Boulevard. According to the policy, "*the parcels traversed by the southeasterly boundary of this General Commercial designation should be developed with commercial uses along the Taylor Road frontage, and with residential uses to the rear…*"

In addition to these proposed measures, the following policies should be added to the General Plan Update to further minimize land use impacts:

- **Additional Policy LU-1.** The boundaries of proposed land use designations should be coincident with existing property boundaries, to the extent possible. One possible exception may be when the frontage of a large lot along a major arterial would be

inappropriate for residential uses, while much of the remainder could be suited for such use.

- **Additional Policy LU-2.** Commercial land uses shall be discouraged away from the Town's core area, except when property is demonstrably unsuitable for residential use because of proximity to noise sources such as major arterials or railroad lines.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of proposed policies, in conjunction with policies recommended in this EIR, is anticipated to fully mitigate impacts relating to land use conflicts. Please also refer to the sections of this EIR concerning noise and visual resources. No additional mitigation is required.

3.9 NOISE

Setting

Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dB level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). A doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dB. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dB greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dB change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dB changes are generally not perceived. Typical ambient sounds range from 30 dBA (very quiet) to about 85 dBA (very loud). Typical exterior ambient noise levels away from obvious noise sources are about 50 to 55 dBA.

There are many rating scales for noise, the most widely-used being the Day-Night Average Level (Ldn) and Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Both methods aggregate noise levels over a 24-hour period, accounting for the annoying effects of sound, particularly at night. In general, interior sound levels exceeding 45 dBA CNEL are considered intrusive. Typical building construction materials filter out about 20 dBA. An exterior noise level of 60 dBA CNEL is the goal of the updated General Plan. However, exterior sound levels up to 65 dBA CNEL are conditionally acceptable for housing, lodging, or meeting facilities, provided adequate building design and construction materials are used to reduce interior noise levels (see Table N-2). The conditionally acceptable exterior noise level for commercial and office buildings is 77 dBA CNEL.

The primary source of noise affecting the Town is traffic using Interstate 80. The Union Pacific Railroad corridor carries freight and passenger trains that also produce substantial noise. Other less prominent noise sources within the Town include the use of equipment associated with agricultural or industrial uses. School activities such football games and band practice are other noise sources affecting the areas near Del Oro High School. See the Draft Public Health and Safety Element for more information regarding the existing noise environment in the Town.

Existing noise levels in the Town near major roads are shown in Table N-1. As a point of reference, Loomis' proposed General Plan Update exterior standard for noise sensitive structures is 60 dBA Ldn, with an interior standard of 45 dBA Ldn. This is the same as is currently adopted by Placer County, and consistent with state standards. Table N-2 shows the land use compatibility matrix for use in making land use planning decisions. Table N-3 shows proposed standards for short-term noise events in the community. Figure 6 shows existing noise contours in the community, which account for both rail and traffic noise.

Figure 6. Existing Noise Contours
(same as Public Health and Safety Element Figure S-5)

Table N-1. Existing Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Traffic (ADT)	Distance to Ldn Contour from Centerline (feet)		
		70 dB	65 dB	60 dB
Interstate 80 Sierra College Blvd to Horseshoe Bar Rd.	84,000	379	816	1,757
Interstate 80 Horseshoe Bar Rd. to Penryn exit	78,000	360	776	1,672
Sierra College Boulevard Interstate 80 to Taylor Road	12,300	84	181	390
Sierra College Boulevard Taylor Road to Bankhead Road	9,300	70	150	324
Sierra College Boulevard n/o King Road	6,100	53	113	244
Taylor Road e/o Sierra College Blvd.	10,500	58	126	271
Taylor Road s/o King Road	13,800	51	110	238
Horseshoe Bar Road Interstate 80 to Brace Road	5,300	-	40	86
King Road w/o Swetzer Court	5,300	-	40	86
Rocklin Road w/o Barton Road	4,500	-	36	77
Barton Road n/o Rocklin Road	1,700	-	-	40
Laird Road s/o High Cliff Road	1,900	-	-	44
Existing Rail Activity	n/a	223	480	1,035

Source: Traffic volumes from Caltrans and Fehr & Peers (1998); see Appendix for model runs.

Table N-2. Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure

Noise Sensitive Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas[1]	Interior Spaces	
	dBA L_{dn}	dBA L_{dn}	dBA L_{eq}
Residential	60	45	--
Transient Lodging	60	45	--
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	60	45	--
Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls	--	--	35
Churches, Meeting Halls	60	--	40
Office Buildings	--	--	45
Schools, Libraries, Museums	--	--	45
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70	--	--

[1] Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknowns, the exterior noise levels standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

[2] Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.

Table N-3. Noise Standards for Short Duration Events Near Residential Areas

Noise Sensitive Land Use	Duration of Sound (minutes per hour)	Standard	
		Day/Evening (7am – 10pm) dB	Night (10pm – 7am) dB
All Residential	30 - 60	50	40
	15 – 30	55	45
	5 – 15	60	50
	1 – 5	65	55
	Less than 1 minute	70	60

[1] If the offensive noise contains a steady, audible tone (such as a screech or hum), or is a repetitive noise such as hammering, or contains speech or music, the standard limits shown shall be reduced by 5 dB.
[2] Source: State of California Model Community Noise Control Ordinance.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. To determine the potential noise impacts of the project, a significance threshold was established using state and local noise compatibility criteria. An impact would be considered significant if the development under the General Plan Update would:

- *Substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas*
- *Exceed the traffic noise-related standards contained in the Land Use Compatibility Matrix (refer to Table N-2 above);*
- *Cause predicted noise levels at outdoor activity areas to exceed 60 dBA Ldn where proposed residential development would occur;*
- *In conjunction with other cumulative development, increase the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, churches, schools or parks) by 3 dB*

Key Issues. The following key issue related to noise was identified during the preparation of the proposed General Plan. This provides the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan Update.

- *Increased volumes of local and commuter traffic on Town arterial roadways and rail corridors create noise impacting residential frontage properties.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issue identified above, the following are considered potentially significant noise impacts:

- Noise levels for land uses that exceed the compatibility matrix in Table N-2;
- The potential for industrial noise events to effect nearby residential land uses; and
- The potential for nuisance noise to affect nearby land uses;

Buildout under the General Plan Update would result in noise increases, both in the short-term (construction noise) and long-term (traffic noise). Additional commercial and industrial development could include truck loading and warehouse areas, both of which could contribute to overall noise increases in the planning area. However, it should be kept in mind that by far the greatest contribution to traffic increases (and therefore noise increases) comes from land

development outside the Town limits. There is little the Town can do to control this noise increase, except to plan its own land uses and roadways to address inevitable noise increases.

Table N-3 shows projected noise levels in the planning area upon full buildout of the General Plan Update and the general plans of neighboring communities (Figure 7). These projections are based on anticipated traffic increases, which in turn are based on the ultimate land use pattern of the Town and surrounding communities. The projected noise contours are generally similar to the existing noise contours, with the most excessive noise levels along Interstate 80. However, projected traffic increases along Sierra College Boulevard would place land uses within a minimum of 240 feet of the roadway in excess of 60 dBA Ldn, the normally acceptable outdoor noise level.

Ambient noise levels would increase throughout the community as a result of future development, both in the Town and region. Most of the new development that would affect the major roadways (I-80, Sierra College Boulevard) would come from outside the Town, notably from Rocklin, Roseville and Lincoln, all projected to have much greater growth under their general plans than would be expected in Loomis. The increase in noise levels that would result cannot be fully mitigated by measures undertaken by new development, as much of the community will fall well within the 60 dBA Ldn contour of major roadways with cumulative development.

Figure 7. Projected Noise Contours
(same as Public Health and Safety Element Figure S-6)

Table N-4. Projected Traffic Noise Levels at Regional Cumulative Buildout

Roadway Segment	Traffic (ADT)	Distance to Ldn Contour from Centerline (feet)		
		70 dB	65 dB	60 dB
Interstate 80 Sierra College Blvd to Horseshoe Bar Rd.	132,000	512	1,102	2,375
Interstate 80 Horseshoe Bar Rd. to Penryn exit	119,900	480	1,034	2,227
Sierra College Boulevard Interstate 80 to Taylor Road	47,300	206	444	957
Sierra College Boulevard Taylor Road to Bankhead Road	34,800	168	362	780
Sierra College Boulevard n/o King Road	24,900	134	290	624
Sierra College Boulevard Bankhead Road to King Road	18,700	111	239	516
Taylor Road e/o Sierra College Blvd.	23,100	99	213	458
Taylor Road s/o King Road	17,800	61	131	282
Taylor Road e/o King Road	11,700	46	99	213
Horseshoe Bar Road Interstate 80 to Brace Road	17,000	40	87	188
King Road w/o Swetzer Court	12,000	32	69	149
Rocklin Road w/o Barton Road	18,300	42	92	197
Barton Road n/o Rocklin Road	7,200	-	49	106
Laird Road s/o High Cliff Road	4,800	-	38	81
Future Rail Activity	n/a	256	551	1,186

Source: Projected traffic volumes from Caltrans and Fehr & Peers (1999); see Appendix for model runs.
Includes the effects of regional cumulative development in neighboring communities.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The following proposed General Plan Update policies address potential impacts related to the noise issues described above:

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-1.** New commercial and industrial development in the Town shall be sited and designed to minimize the potential for harmful or annoying noise to create conflict with existing land uses.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-2.** Loomis shall encourage the mitigation of noise impacts in all new developments as necessary to maintain the quiet, rural ambiance of the Town.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-3.** An acoustical analysis shall be required for new residential structures located within the projected noise contour of 60 dBA Ldn, showing that the structures have been designed to limit intruding noise in interior rooms to an annual level of 45 dBA Ldn.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-4.** Individual noise exposure analysis shall be required for proposed development projects as part of the environmental review process, to ensure that the Town's noise standards are meet. The use of mitigation measures (noise buffers, sound insulation) may be required to reduce noise impacts to acceptable levels.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-5.** Loomis shall prohibit the construction of sound walls to mitigate noise impacts, unless it is the only feasible alternative. New sensitive noise receptors shall not be permitted if the only feasible mitigation for noise impacts is a sound wall.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-6.** Where noise mitigation is necessary, the following order of preference among options shall be considered: distance from the noise source; muffling of the noise source; design and orientation of the receptor; landscaped berms; landscaped berms in combination with walls.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-7.** Use the land use/noise compatibility matrix shown on Figure S-4 (Table N-3 of the EIR) to determine the appropriate ness of land uses relative to roadway noise.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-8.** Work with Caltrans to install mitigation elements along freeways and highways adjacent to existing residential subdivisions or noise-sensitive uses to reduce noise impacts.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-9.** Provide for alternative transportation modes such as bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways to minimize the number of automobile trips.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-10.** Require that new equipment and vehicles purchased by the Town comply with noise performance standards consistent with the best available noise reduction technology.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-11.** Work with public transit agencies to ensure that the buses, vans, and other vehicles used do not generate excessive noise levels.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-12.** Consider the use of rubberized asphalt paving material for future road paving and re-paving. Studies have indicated that such paving material can result in a 3 to 5 dBA reduction in noise.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-13.** Consider the use of speed humps and other "traffic calming" devices to reduce traffic noise in residential areas, when supported by the residential community in question..

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-14.** Work with the Union Pacific Railroad to properly maintain lines and establish operational restrictions during the early morning and late evening hours to reduce impacts in residential areas and other noise sensitive areas.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-15.** Require that automobile and truck access to industrial and commercial properties adjacent to residential areas be located at the maximum practical distance from the residential area.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-16.** Require that all parking for industrial and commercial uses adjacent to residential areas be enclosed within a structure or buffered by walls.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-17.** Limit the use of leaf blowers, motorized lawn mowers, parking lot sweepers, or other high-noise equipment on commercial properties if their activity will result in noise which adversely affects residential areas.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-18.** Require that the hours of truck deliveries to industrial and commercial properties adjacent to residential uses be limited unless there is no feasible alternative or there are overriding transportation benefits by scheduling deliveries at another hour.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-19.** Require that construction activities adjacent to residential units be limited as necessary to prevent adverse noise impacts.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-20.** The Town should develop standards for acceptable nuisance noise levels for both day and night.

- **Policy PS&SE (Noise)-21.** Future industrial or commercial development in areas determined to be near noise-sensitive land uses shall be subject to an acoustical analysis to determine the potential for stationary source noise impacts to neighboring land uses.

In addition, the following proposed General Plan Update implementation measures would further reduce noise impacts:

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-1.** Establish exterior land use noise compatibility standards in the Zoning Ordinance for all new development based on the guidelines shown on Figure S-4 (EIR Table N-3) and Table S-3 of this Element.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-2.** Incorporate in the Zoning Ordinance requirements that limit maximum interior levels to 45 dBA Ldn in all new residential construction.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-3.** For new development within the generalized 60 dBA Ldn noise contour as shown in Figure S-6 of this Element, project applicants shall fund site-specific noise studies to mitigate project impacts.

The determination of whether a project site is within the 60 dBA Ldn contour is the responsibility of the Planning Department. The required noise analysis shall:

- Include field measurements by a qualified environmental scientist/acoustical engineer to determine a more precise location of existing and projected future noise levels (based on traffic projections included in the Circulation Element or as accepted by the Town); and

- Identify and commit to measures to mitigate noise impacts (by siting of structure outside of high noise levels, insulation, attenuation, walls or buffers, landscape, or other acceptable techniques) if within the 60 dBA contour.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-4.** When development is subject to high noise levels requiring mitigation, the following measures shall be considered and preference shall be given where feasible in the following order:

    1. Site layout, including setbacks, open space separation and shielding of noise sensitive uses with non-noise-sensitive uses.
    2. Acoustical treatment of buildings.
    3. Structural measures: construction of earthen berms and/or wood or concrete barriers.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-5.** Incorporate into the Zoning Ordinance standards that protect inhabitants from impacts of exterior noise, prevent the transference of interior noise to the outside, prevent transference of noise between residential units and individual businesses in multi-tenant buildings, and prevent transference of noise between commercial and residential uses in mixed structures. Standards for insulation, windows, building materials, walls and roofs shall be included.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-6.** Include in the Zoning Ordinance standards and requirements for parking structures and lots to prevent noise effects on-site and on adjacent noise sensitive uses. These could include the use of buffers containing landscape and/or sound walls, use of sound absorbing materials to minimize sound amplification and transmission, enclosure of the façade of parking structures facing a residence, limitation of the hours of operation of surrounding surface parking lots, and other appropriate techniques.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-7.** The Town shall review development proposals according to their potential noise impacts on abutting uses and impacts by abutting uses in accordance with the standards and requirements stipulated by this Element and incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-8.** The Town shall consider the use of temporary noise barriers, limited hours of operation, limiting times of year for construction near schools to reduce construction-related noise.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-9.** The Town shall review the street layout of proposed residential subdivisions with the objective of reducing traffic volumes and through trips as a means to reduce noise levels. The use of road dips, diagonal parking, one-way streets, speed humps, and other traffic controls shall be considered to reduce vehicular travel and speed, provided that engineering and safety standards are met. If determined to be feasible, rubberized asphalt paving material may be required for new roads.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-10.** Speed limits are legally set in accordance with the prevailing speed of traffic based on engineering studies. However, when feasible, consistent and necessary, the reduction of speed limits on arterials should be used to decrease ambient noise levels.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-11.** The Town shall evaluate the noise impacts of truck deliveries on adjacent residential properties as a part of the development and environmental review process for all commercial and manufacturing uses. Where truck deliveries would have the potential to create noise exceeding 60 dBA CNEL at an adjacent noise sensitive use, the inclusion of noise mitigation techniques such as the use of sound wall or enclosure of delivery areas shall be required.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-12.** To reduce noise associated with truck traffic, the Town should implement the following noise reduction strategies:

    1. The Town and Caltrans shall consider limitations on hours of operation and other truck operations that could be limited to reduce noise impacts.
    2. The Town should encourage the use of established designated truck routes that avoid residential areas and confine truck traffic to major thoroughfares.
    3. The Town should post designated areas and times to prohibit the use of jake brakes along established truck routes adjacent to sensitive uses.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-13.** Support the efforts of the California Department of Transportation and local transportation agencies in developing noise reduction measures for Interstate 80, including elevating or depressing roads, or if no feasible alternatives exist, sound barrier walls.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-14.** Maintain a data file documenting existing and future noise conditions, using the contour map contained in this Plan. As noise assessments are conducted for proposed projects or other noise studies are performed, the data base shall be updated. The noise data shall be updated entirely at least once every five years.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-15.** Work with railroad operators to determine when noise controls may be necessary due to the adjacency of railroad lines to residential uses.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-16.** The Town shall enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) and Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-17.** Future industrial or commercial development in areas determined to be near noise-sensitive land uses, as shown in Figure S-6, shall be subject to an acoustical analysis at the discretion of the Planning Director, to determine the potential for stationary source noise impacts to neighboring land uses.

- **Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-18.** Where noise-sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected noise levels in excessive of the standards contained in Tables S-3 and S-4. The Town shall require an acoustical analysis as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design. At the discretion of the Planning Director, the requirement for an acoustical analysis may be waived if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

    a. The development is for less than five single-family dwellings or less than 10,000 square feet of total gross floor area for office buildings, churches, or meeting halls;
    b. The noise source in question consists of a single roadway or railroad for which up-to-date noise exposure information is available. An acoustical analysis will be required if the noise source is a stationary noise source, or if there are multiple noise sources that could affect the project;
    c. The projected future noise exposure at the exterior of proposed buildings or outdoor activity areas does not exceed 60 dBA Ldn;
    d. The topography of the area is essentially flat; and
    e. Effective noise mitigation, as determined by the Planning Director, is incorporated into the project design. Such measures can include, but are not limited to, the use of building setbacks, building orientation, noise barriers. If closed windows are required for compliance with interior noise level standards, air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system will be required.

These mitigative policies would substantially address potential impacts associated with new development. However, two proposed implementation measures should be clarified. Implementation Measure PS&SE (Noise)-11 should be modified to address vehicles in general, rather than just truck deliveries. Measure 12 should be modified to say "should" instead of "shall", because there is no mechanism to require the cooperation of Caltrans. In addition, the measure should note that designated truck routes must be followed.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of proposed policies is anticipated to mitigate impacts relating to noise to the extent possible. However, it is likely that noise increases associated with cumulative development would cause significant and unavoidable impacts, which cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level.

3.10 PUBLIC SERVICES (Police, Fire, Schools, Libraries and Parks)

Setting

This section analyzes impacts to police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, and park/recreation facilities.

6.2.1 Law Enforcement

Police Protection. Law enforcement services are provided in Loomis by the Placer County Sheriff's Department. The department operates from the South Placer Substation located at Horseshoe Bar Road and Interstate 80 in Loomis. About 27 deputies are based out of the substation and are responsible for patrolling west and south Placer County. The South Placer Substation staff includes 4.25 patrol deputy, 0.5 sergeant, and 0.25 detective positions. Deputies from this substation provide 24-hour protection.

The crime rate in Loomis is relatively low, and calls for law enforcement services are usually directed at the protection of property rather than responding to emergency incidents. The Department has found that community involvement programs, such as Neighborhood Watch, are particularly effective in assisting the efforts of Sheriff's patrols.

Response times average about 3.5 minutes for priority one (more critical) calls and 6.7 minutes for priority two calls (Town of Loomis, *Heritage Park Estates Draft EIR*, 1998). The Town of Loomis tries to maintain 1 sworn officer per 800 residents, but this is not an adopted standard (Town of Loomis, *Sherwood Park Draft EIR*, 1998). Based on this, the Town would currently need about 7.5 law enforcement positions assigned to it. Current staffing levels do not meet this standard.

Fire Protection. The Loomis Fire Protection District (LFPD) serves nearly all of the planning area. Only a small portion of the planning area is outside the LFPD's service area. The Penryn Fire District and South Placer Fire District serve very small portions of the planning area. The California Department of Forestry also provides fire protection services, particularly with regard to rural wildland fires. These agencies and their service abilities are described below.

Loomis Fire Protection District. The Loomis Fire Protection District operates two fire stations. Station No. 1 is located in downtown Loomis, at the corner of Horseshoe Bar Road and Magnolia Avenue. Station No. 2 is about 2 miles east of the planning area, located in a rural area at the corner of Horseshoe Bar and Tudsbury roads. The LFPD's service boundaries are much larger than the planning area. In all, the district serves about 10,000 residents, 60% of whom reside in Loomis.

In addition to fire protection services, LFPD personnel provide first response to emergency calls, emergency medical care, hazardous spill removal, and rescue assistance. Typically, the district receives about 600 emergency calls per year, about 45% of which are for medical assistance. Only about 10% of these calls are for fires or mutual aid assistance (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR*, 1993). Of the remainder, about 20% are related to

vehicle accidents or other citizen assistance. Other calls relate to a variety of purposes, including hazardous materials, public relations, and other citizen-oriented inquiries. False alarms comprise only about 1% of all calls.

The district maintains 12 permanent staff and about 30 volunteers. Emergency response equipment at Station No. 1 includes one rescue squad and three engines, while Station No. 2 houses a rescue unit/grass fire truck and two engines. Emergency response times typically range from 3 to 4 minutes.

The Insurance Service Office (ISO) rates fire districts for their firefighting ability on a scale of 1-10, 1 being best. The ISO rating for the LFPD is 7.

In 1997, community voters approved a special tax per parcel to finance fire district operations. Currently, this special tax is $63.46 per year for single-family residences. This tax is adjusted annually based on the cost price index. Capital costs are funded through impact fees collected when a building permit is issued. For single-family dwellings smaller than 2,100 square feet, the impact fee is currently $560. Over that size, an additional fee of $0.28 per square foot is charged.

Penryn Fire District. The Penryn Fire District operates one fire station located on Church Street, off English Colony Way, in Penryn. The station serves about 3,000 residents, including many businesses in Loomis. The district receives about 250 calls per year, about 42% of which are related to fire incidents (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR*, 1993). Response times range from 3 to 5 minutes. The ISO rating for the district is 6.

South Placer Fire District. The southernmost portion of the Town is within the South Placer Fire District (SPFD). In addition to fire protection, SPFD provides a range of other community services including first response to hazardous materials calls, building inspection, public education, and emergency medical services. Approximately 65-75 percent of the service calls received by the SPFD are for emergency medical response. The remaining 25-35 percent of the calls are for firefighting or other services. The SPFD serves a 36-square-mile service area from six district stations. The SPFD maintains mutual aid agreements with the Loomis Fire Protection District and others.

Because the southern portion of the Town is rural, grassland fire hazards would be a particular concern to the SPFD. Since the district receives no assistance from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDFFP), a substantial portion of resources are devoted to grassland fire control. Weed abatement is provided on a volunteer basis and is encouraged by SPFD through public education.

Insurance Service Office (ISO) ratings indicate the relative ability of a fire department to provide fire protection services and are used to determine fire insurance costs. The rating reflects fire suppression response time based on a schedule of ten public protection classifications. A rating of 1 is indicative of excellent firefighting capability and, therefore, the lowest insurance rating. A rating of 10 indicates poor firefighting capability and, accordingly, higher insurance risks. The SPFD maintains an ISO rating of 4 in areas with fire hydrants, and 8 in rural areas without a reliable water supply.

California Department of Forestry. The entire planning area is served by the CDF. This agency is responsible for controlling wildland fires in the unincorporated areas of the state. In Placer County, the CDF operates stations in Auburn, Lincoln, Colfax, Foresthill, Alta, and Higgins. The Auburn or Lincoln stations are most likely to serve the planning area, but all stations could respond in the event of a major wildfire.

Schools. Loomis is served primarily by two school districts: Placer Union High School District (PUHSD) and Loomis Union School District (LUSD). The PUHSD serves grade 9-12, while the LUSD serves grades K-8. The facilities and enrollments within these districts are described below. A very small portion of the Town is located at the edge of the Penryn and Rocklin school districts.

Placer Union High School District. Placer Union High School District operates several high schools within its far-reaching boundaries. Only Del Oro High School lies within the planning area, and is the only one to serve planning area residents. Its permanent capacity of 1,084 is augmented by 12 portable classrooms. The school's enrollment of about 1,400 exceeds the permanent capacity by about 29%. Table PS-1 shows the enrollment and capacity of Del Oro High School.

Loomis Union School District. There are three schools within the LUSD. Loomis Elementary School serves grades K-6, while both Franklin and Placer Elementary schools serve grades K-8. The current enrollment districtwide exceeds the permanent capacity of the facilities by about 10%. Only Loomis Elementary School has any remaining capacity, but this is offset by overenrollment at the other schools. Portable classrooms are used to house excess enrollment. With the recent introduction of the statewide Class Size Reduction Program, the demand for new facilities will increase, and the shortage of space will be exacerbated. Table PS-1 shows the current capacity and enrollment within planning area schools.

Table PS-1. Planning Area School Capacity and Enrollment

School	Capacity	Enrollment	Percent of Capacity
Loomis USD			
Franklin (K-8)	530	699	132%
Loomis (K-6)	659	567	86%
Placer (K-8)	537	624	116%
Total LUSD	*1,726*	*1,890*	*110%*
Placer UHSD			
Del Oro High (9-12)	1,084	1,400	129%
TOTAL all schools	**2,810**	**3,212**	**114%**

Sources: Mark Allgire, LUSD, April 2000; Placer Union High School District, 1999

In response to overenrollment pressures, the LUSD is currently constructing a new facility, called H. Clarke Powers Elementary School, at 3296 Humphrey Road. When completed, the K-8 facility will have a capacity of about 600. The first phase is set for completion in August 2000, and will accommodate about 220 students in grades K-4. The remaining phases are scheduled for completion within 2-5 years. Even with a fully operational elementary school, the LUSD expects that overenrollment will remain a long-term concern (Allgire, LUSD, personal

communication). As of April 2000, there are athletic fields in place on the site that function as joint use recreational facilities between the LUSD and the Town.

Penryn School District. Although a small portion of the Town (near Angelo Court) lies within the PSD, the only school within the district is Penryn School, a K-8 facility located on English Colony Way in Penryn, about 3 miles northeast of Loomis. The current capacity is 360, and enrollment is about the same.

Rocklin School District. About 5 to 10 parcels along Del Mar Avenue are located in the Rocklin School District. The Town contributes very few students to the district, a condition that would not change under the General Plan Update.

Facilities Funding. Revenue for facilities construction comes from both state and local sources, including developer fees. Both the PUHSD and LUSD participate in the Office of Public School Construction 50/50 program, whereby new development contributes half of the cost of new facilities, while the remainder is supplied by the state.

A statutory fee that also contributes to funding facilities is the Stirling fee. This fee, currently $1.93 per square foot, is based on the amount of building construction proposed and is adjusted annually. The fee is split between the LUSD and PUHSD, with the two districts receiving $1.16 and $0.77, respectively. However, it has been found that reliance on such developer fees is insufficient to meet the facilities needs.

Consequently, the LUSD has implemented its Mutual Benefit School Impact Fee Agreement, which imposes the following fees on residential developments: $5,015 per single-family home; $3,023 per duplex; and $1,937 per multi-family unit. A similar agreement was initiated by the PUHSD in March 1998, with fees as follows: $3,483 per single-family home; $2,589 per duplex; and $656 per multi-family unit.

In the past, statutory limitations regarding the payment of development fees to school districts were placed on projects that did not require quasi-legislative approvals, such as zoning amendments, rezoning, general plan amendments, specific plans, and development agreements, as decided in the Mira, Hart, and Murietta State Supreme Court cases. In cases where projects required quasi-legislative approvals the Courts allowed local agencies to collect additional fees as mitigation measures under CEQA.

However, the November 1998 passage of Proposition 1A, and the funding made available through its passage, requires the implementation of Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), and eliminates the additional funding allowed per the Mira, Hart and Murietta cases. Instead, SB 50 provides for Level Two and Level Three fees in residential development; these fees are allowed to be in excess of the previous limitation of $1.93 per square foot. Level Two fees require the developer to provide one-half of the costs of housing students in new schools, while the state would provide the other half. Level Three fees would require the developer to pay the full cost of housing the Students in new schools and would be implemented at the time the funds available from Proposition 1A are expended. School districts must demonstrate to the state their long-term facilities needs and costs based on long-term population growth in order to qualify for this source of funding. Once qualified, the district may impose fees as calculated per SB 50.

There are two sets of requirements that a district must meet in order to levy Level Two/Three fees. The first set consists of (1) being eligible for state funding of new construction and (2) making "a timely application to the State Allocation Board for new construction funding." The first establishes that the district has inadequate capacity to accommodate its enrollment. The second is intended to ensure that the district participates in the State program in addition to seeking supplemental mitigation from developers.

The local school districts are currently pursuing funding through these mechanisms. In its response to the NOP for this EIR, the LUSD indicated support for the recent Town Council action taken enabling the school district to require developers to enter into a mutual benefit agreement to help provide funding for local school facilities. But since the recent legislation no longer allows school districts to require this financing mechanisms, the LUSD is seeking assistance and cooperation from the Town to pursue other financing mechanisms, if possible.

Libraries. The Auburn-Placer County Library provides service to the region and operates several branches throughout the County. The Loomis Branch Library is the only one within the planning area, and is located at 6050 Library Drive in Loomis. According to the Library Long-Range Plan, this branch may undergo a reduction in operating hours. However, a future expansion of the Loomis Library may occur according to the Plan, though no timetable has been established. Other nearby branches that could serve area residents are located in Penryn, Rocklin, Auburn, and Granite Bay.

Parks and Recreation Facilities. The Town of Loomis owns and operates one park site, in Sunrise Loomis. The Town also contributes funds to the Loomis Unified School District to provide recreational improvements to their facilities. Although schools limit the use of their facilities, they represent a significant source for meeting recreational needs for Loomis residents. Placer County operates the Loomis Basin Regional Park on the northeast border of the Town which are regularly used by Loomis residents. In addition, Sierra Community College has recreational facilities available for limited use by non-students. Bikeways, hiking and equestrian trails also provide recreational opportunities for residents. Figure 4-1 in the Technical Background Report for the General Plan Update identifies the locations of all park and recreation facilities in Loomis. An inventory of park and recreational facilities in and nearby Loomis that are frequented by Town residents is provided in Table PS-2.

Table PS-2. Park and Recreational Facilities Accessible to the Town of Loomis

Facility	Amenities	Acreage	Location
Parks:			
Sunrise-Loomis Neighborhood Park	2 softball fields; 1 tot lot; picnic area; open space	4.0	North Planning Area on Arcadia Avenue, between Humphrey and Swetzer Roads
Loomis Basin Regional Park (Placer County)	2 softball fields; 1 soccer field; 1 tot lot; picnic area; snack bar; portable restrooms, basketball court	33.0	Intersection of King and Winters Roads
Schools Facilities:			
Loomis Elementary School	2 softball fields; 2 volleyball courts; 3 basketball courts; track field; tot lot	3.5	Intersection of Taylor and King Roads
H. Clarke Powers School	2 ball fields/soccer fields	6.5	Humphrey Road
Franklin Elementary School	3 ball diamonds; 1 soccer field; 2 basketball courts; 1 tract field; 2 volleyball courts; 1 tot lot	4.2	Laird Road
Del Oro High School	1 softball field; 2 soccer fields; 1 football fields; track field; pool; 4 basketball courts; 5 tennis courts; 2 hardball courts	25.0 (approx.)	Taylor Road
Sierra Community College	track fields; trails	not known	Intersection of Rocklin Road and Sierra College Blvd.
Total Acreage		**76.2**	

Source: Town of Loomis Park and Recreation Master Plan.

The parks and recreation needs assessment prepared and adopted by the Town indicated that the appropriate parks standard to apply to Loomis is five acres of park area per 1,000 population. Existing park and recreation facilities are generally located in the north area of town (above I-80). Therefore, the needs assessment identified future recreation needs based on the town population and demographics as a whole, and on the two major north/south planning areas. The results of the needs assessment indicate a current (1998) park land need for the north planning area of 21 acres, and a future (2005) need of 28 acres. The south planning area, which does not currently have any existing park facilities, is projected to need 9 acres of parkland by the year 2005. Park needs are further defined as needing approximately 7.9 acres of active park land and 30 acres of passive/open space acreage. The parks and recreation land and facility needs represent minimum, versus maximum needs. In addition, the Town does not currently have a multi-use community center available to provide recreation opportunities, group meeting facilities. At present, the Memorial Hall in the downtown area serves this function.

Bikeways and trails are another means to meet the recreational needs of Town residents. The Town of Loomis has designated several bikeways and trails within the community, which are also part of the Placer County Bikeway System and Trails Master Plan. Currently, one bikeway has been developed in Loomis along King Road, and portions of Taylor Road. The County has designated four additional bikeways within Loomis, which remain unimproved.

As noted above, Antelope Creek and Secret Ravine provide opportunities for open space corridors potentially providing hiking and equestrian trails. The creeks provide connections between the north and south areas of town, and to areas south of Loomis. The County has designated Secret Ravine as a Class 1 bicycle corridor in the regional bicycle transportation plan. The corridor is planned to extend from Loomis Basin Regional Park, west to the City of Roseville. This bikeway has not yet been improved. Secret Ravine has also been designated as an hiking and equestrian trail in the Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association Trails Master Plan and in other County planning documents. While no bikeways or trails have been designated along Antelope Creek, it is an important open space resource providing flood protection and significant riparian habitat value, and is also used as an informal hiking trail.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. A significant impact to public services would occur if future development would overtax the capacity for local law enforcement, schools, and fire protection, and recreational facilitiesto serve such development. Impacts would also be significant if new development would impeded the ability to provide such services.

Key Issues. The following key issue related to the provision of public services were identified during the preparation of the General Plan Update. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan.

- *The Town's 1997 park and recreation needs assessment indicates a need for additional park and recreation facilities and services. These include new parks, ball fields, playgrounds, courts, and bike paths and trails.*

- *The resident survey prepared for the General Plan update highlighted the need for a community center.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issue identified above, the following are considered potentially significant impacts of development under the General Plan Update:

- Increased demand for various public services, including police, fire, education and library services; and
- Increased demand for recreational facilities.

Police Protection. Growth that could be accommodated under the General Plan Update would increase demand for police protection services. Potential buildout could accommodate a population increase of about 10,400, a 70% over the current population of 6,100. Current

staffing assigns the equivalent of five sworn officers to the Loomis area. This is currently less than what would be required based on the unofficial ratio of 1 officer per 800 population, about 7.5 officers. At buildout, there would be the need for 13 sworn officer positions, 8 more than current staffing levels. It is anticipated that funding will be made available as development occurs, allowing for an incremental increase in staffing as the need arises. Because development would be limited to areas that are currently served, future response times are likely to be adequate, provided that recommended traffic-related mitigation measures are implemented.

Fire Protection. Growth under the General Plan Update would result in increased demand for fire protection services. Although there are currently no adopted manpower standards for the Town, it is anticipated that new development would require additional personnel and equipment to maintain the current level of service. Other issues of concern include the need to provide adequate water pressure and availability to effectively fight fires. Impacts are potentially significant. Because development would be limited to areas that are currently served, future response times are likely to be adequate, provided that recommended traffic-related mitigation measures are implemented.

Schools. New development that would be accommodated under the General Plan Update would increase enrollment at the already overenrolled Loomis USD and Placer UHSD Based on standard student generation rates used in the districts, about 1,128 new students would be generated upon buildout of the General Plan Update. Table PS-3 shows the projected enrollment in the districts, which would collectively exceed capacity by more than 54%. Assuming that no additional schools are built, enrollment will continue to exceed overall capacity. H. Clarke Powers Elementary School is currently under construction, and would accommodate 600 students, grade K-8. Even with this new school, long-term classroom shortages are likely to occur.

Table PS-3. Projected Enrollment at Buildout

Facility	Current Enrollment	Anticipated Increase *	Projected Enrollment At Buildout	Current Capacity
Loomis USD	1,890	748	2,560	1,726
Placer UHSD	1,400	380	1,780	1,084
TOTAL	**3,290**	**1,128**	**4,340**	**2,810**

Based on 0.459 students per household (K-8) and 0.233 students per household (9-12), per Placer County Office of Education. Does not include H. Clarrke Powers Elementary School, currently under construction. It would increase capacity by 600 students, grades K-8.

Library Service. Buildout under the General Plan Update would increase demand for library services within the Town. The existing facility is adequate to meet current demands, which would call for a 3,050-square foot building based on a typical planning ratio of 0.5 square feet of library per capita. With a projected buildout population estimated at 10,400, library facilities should be about 5,200 square feet to adequately handle demand. However, the nature of library services is changing, in part because of the proliferation of electronically available data through the Internet, a resource that does not depend on a central physical repository for information. Consequently, current service standards may become obsolete by the time buildout under the General Plan Update occurs.

Parks and Recreation. Based on the 1998 park needs assessment conducted for the community, a standard of five acres per 1,000 population was established for active parks. Neighborhood park needs were based on a 3 acres per 1,000 population standard, while community parks were based on 2 acres per 1,000 population. Based on existing population, about 30.5 acres of active parkland (18.3 acres of neighborhood parks and 12.2 acres of community parks) should be available. Including school facilities, there are about 76.2 acres available for all types of park uses (Table PS-2), though very few neighborhood parks, and none south of Interstate 80.

Full buildout under the General Plan Update would increase demand for parks and recreational facilities in the Town. Based on the referenced standards, park demand at buildout would be for 52 acres of active parks (31.2 acres of neighborhood parks and 20.8 acres of community parks). Current park acreage is adequate to meet this overall demand, but there would still be substantial shortages of neighborhood-scale facilities, especially in the area south of Interstate 80.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The following General Plan Update policies are intended to address impacts related to the provision of public facilities.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 1.** The Town will pursue all available funding mechanisms to provide a multi-use community center.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 2.** The Town will work toward providing additional park and recreation facilities to meet the needs of Loomis residents as the Town's population increases.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 3.** Loomis shall adopt city park and recreational standards to guide and promote the development of recreational open space, in addition to working with Placer County in the provision of public recreation facilities.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 4.** New residential developments shall provide for the recreational open space needs of their residents.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 5.** Loomis shall encourage the compatible recreational use of riparian and stream corridors, where feasible.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 6.** Loomis shall support and cooperate with volunteer groups and organizations that provide recreational activities for Town residents.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 7.** Open space areas shall be designed as part of an integrated citywide network, in conjunction with bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian trails.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 8.** Loomis shall require new development to contribute - through fees, dedications, or other appropriate means - toward the maintenance of existing levels of municipal services.

- **Policy LUE (Parks and Recreation) 9.** Loomis will continue to work with local school districts and the County to extend the park and recreation opportunities of Loomis residents through joint-use facilities.

- **Policy PS (Public Services) 1.** Loomis will work toward achieving and maintaining acceptable levels of municipal services, including public safety, roadway maintenance, and administrative services. Loomis will cooperate with regional public service agencies to attain adequate service levels for water distribution, sewerage services, flood management, and solid waste collection.

- **Policy PS (Public Services) 2.** Non-residential and higher density residential development shall not be expanded into areas lacking public services infrastructure until existing vacant land with these services within the Town limits is utilized, or proposed development ensures the extension of necessary infrastructure through actual construction or payment of fees.

- **Policy PS (Public Services) 3.** Loomis shall work with the school districts (Placer Union High School District and Loomis Union School District) in reviewing district land use decisions involving the provision of adequate educational facilities for Loomis students.

- **Policy PS (Public Services) 4.** Proposed development shall be connected to public water supply and sewage disposal systems as follows:
  a. All development proposed in nonresidential land use designations shall be connected to the community water supply and sewage disposal systems prior to occupancy.
  b. Residential development proposed on parcels of 2.2 acres or less shall be connected to the community water supply and sewage disposal systems prior to occupancy.

- **Policy PS (Public Services) 5.** Loomis shall work with the solid waste collector (Auburn Placer Disposal Service) in developing a recycling program for Loomis residents.

- **Policy CIRC (Circulation) 1.** The Town shall aggressively pursue state and federal funding to implement the primary elements of the Town's Circulation Plan.

- **Policy CIRC (Circulation) 2.** The Town shall require proposed new development projects to analyze their contribution to increased vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic and to implement the roadway improvements necessary to address their impact.

- **Policy CIRC (Circulation) 3.** The Town shall assess fees on new development sufficient to cover the fair share portion of development's cumulative impacts on the local and regional transportation system.

In addition, the following implementation measures provide further mitigation for potential impacts:

- **Implementation Measure LUE (Parks and Recreation) 1.** The Town will evaluate and consider the following financing options to procure park land and recreational facilities, and a multi-use community center. These options are described in detail in the Town of Loomis Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Chapter VI, Financial Plan.)

- **Implementation Measure LUE (Parks and Recreation) 2.** The Town will evaluate the existing park land and recreation in-lieu impact fee program and recommend revisions if determined appropriate.

- **Implementation Measure LUE (Parks and Recreation) 3.** The Town will evaluate the existing park land and recreation use fee schedule to determine if amendments to the current program are necessary.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of these policies and measures would ensure the provision of public services as the Town builds out under the General Plan Update. No additional measures would be required.

3.11 TRANSPORTATION and CIRCULATION

Setting

The Circulation Element of General Plan provides a comprehensive description of existing conditions in the community, as does the Technical Background Report for the General Plan. The most important aspects of this information are summarized below.

Roadways Operations. Automobiles are the primary form of transportation for most types of trips in Loomis, although the Town's bikeway system has become increasingly important as an alternative. The Town's circulation system is described in detail in the Draft Circulation Element. Interstate 80 is the only freeway in the Town, serving as the principal regional highway. Traffic flow is generally good, but degrades during peak traffic periods. Other important roads serving the community are described below:

- *Taylor Road* - is a major arterial from Eureka Road in Roseville paralleling Interstate 80 (I-80) through Rocklin, Loomis, Penryn, and Newcastle, and terminating at State Route 193 (SR 193) near Auburn. Taylor Road has one lane in each direction within Loomis.

- *Horseshoe Bar Road* - is an east-west arterial from Taylor Road to Folsom Lake in unincorporated Placer County. Horseshoe Bar Road has one lane in each direction.

- *King Road* - is an east-west arterial from Del Mar Avenue across I-80 to beyond Folsom-Auburn Road. King Road has one lane in each direction.

- *Sierra College Boulevard* - is a major arterial from SR 193, south through Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville, and into Sacramento County, where it becomes Hazel Avenue. Sierra College Boulevard has one lane in each direction from SR 193 to south of I-80, beyond the Loomis Town limit.

- *Barton Road* - is a north-south arterial from Brace Road into Granite Bay in unincorporated Placer County. Barton Road has one lane in each direction.

- *Brace Road* - is an east-west arterial from Taylor Road across I-80 to Horseshoe Bar Road. Brace Road has one lane in each direction.

- *Swetzer Road* - is a two-lane collector street from King Road to beyond the Town Limits.

Table CIRC-1 and Figure 8 display average weekday daily traffic volumes on key roadways within the Town of Loomis. Traffic counts were conducted by Fehr & Peers Associates in June, 1998 where necessary to complement the 1996 and 1997 count data from the Shadowbrook EIR and the Downtown Loomis Parking and Circulation Study. The segments of Taylor Road and Horseshoe Bar Road near the downtown area and Sierra College Boulevard near Taylor Road carry the greatest volumes of traffic (between 9,000 and 14,000 vehicles per day). Traffic volumes on King Road, Swetzer Road, Webb Street, Barton Road, Laird Road, and Brace Road

range from approximately 1,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day. Table 2 summarizes the daily volume-to-capacity ratio for each roadway (based on capacities used by the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County).

Table CIRC-2 displays AM and PM peak hour turning movement volumes, lane configurations, and traffic control devices at key intersections within the Town of Loomis. Traffic counts were conducted by Fehr & Peers Associates where necessary in June, 1998 to complement the 1996 and 1997 counts from the Shadowbrook EIR and the Downtown Loomis Parking and Circulation Study. As shown, traffic signals are located on Taylor Road at Sierra College Boulevard, Horseshoe Bar Road, and King Road. Traffic signals are also located at the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard eastbound and westbound ramps intersections and at the I-80/Horseshoe Bar Road westbound ramps intersection. The remaining study intersections are stop-controlled on the side-street approach.

Peak hour intersection operations were evaluated by computing the level of service (LOS) at each intersection. Level of service is a term that describes the operating performance of an intersection or roadway, and is reported on a scale from A to F, with A representing the best performance and F representing the worst.

Table CIRC-2 shows that each intersection currently operates at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the Taylor Road/King Road intersection, which operates at LOS D during the AM peak hour. Field observations indicate that this intersection actually operates at LOS E or F during the peak 30 minutes in the morning when school is in session. To avoid this congested intersection, many motorists use Webb Street to travel between northwest Loomis and the downtown area.

Although the Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road intersection operates at LOS C or better during each peak hour, field observations indicated significant queuing of northbound right-turn vehicles (queues extended beyond Laird Street), eastbound through vehicles, and westbound left-turn vehicles (queues exceeded the available turn lane storage).

Sierra College Boulevard, Taylor Road, and Horseshoe Bar Road (north of I-80) carry the greatest volume of truck traffic in Loomis. Traffic counts conducted in September, 1997 revealed that the segments of Taylor Road and Horseshoe Bar Road through the downtown area carried about 400 to 450 trucks (3 or more axles) per day. This represents between two and four percent of all traffic on these roadways. With the exception of Sierra College Boulevard, none of the roadways within Loomis are posted as truck routes. King Road has "Not a Truck Route" signs, while Brace Road has signs indicating truck weight restrictions.

Figure 8. Existing Traffic Volumes
(from Circulation Element Figure 2)

Table CIRC-1. Existing Roadway Segment Operations

Roadway Segment	Number of Lanes	Average Daily Traffic	Daily Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
Sierra College Blvd. - north of King Road	2	6,100	0.27
Sierra College Blvd. - between King Road and Bankhead	2	5,400	0.24
Sierra College Blvd. - between Bankhead Road and Taylor Rd	2	9,300	0.41
Sierra College Blvd. - between Taylor and I-80 (in Rocklin)	2	12,300	0.54
Sierra College Bl. - Rocklin Rd. to Ridge Park Dr. (in Rocklin)	2	14,400	0.63
Taylor Rd. -between Sierra College Bl. and Horseshoe Bar Rd.	2	10,500	0.70
Taylor Rd. -between Horseshoe Bar Road and King Road	2	13,800	0.92
Taylor Rd. -east of King Road	2	6,100	0.41
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Taylor Road and Magnolia Ave.	2	10,400	0.69
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Magnolia Avenue and I-80	2	12,600	0.84
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between I-80 and Brace Road	2	5,300	0.23
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - east of Oak Tree Lane	2	3,500	0.15
King Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and Bankhead Road	2	2,200	0.14
King Rd. - between Arcadia Avenue and Taylor Road	2	5,300	0.35
King Rd. - between Taylor Road and Boyington Road	2	3,900	0.26
Webb Street - between Saunders Avenue and Taylor Road	2	3,500	0.23
Bankhead Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and King Road	2	3,400	0.23
Del Mar Avenue - north of Alvis Court	2	400	0.03
Laird Road - south of High Cliff Road	2	1,900	0.08
Barton Road - south of Brace Road	2	1,400	0.06
Barton Road - north of Rocklin Road	2	1,700	0.07
Rocklin Road - west of Barton Road	2	4,500	0.20
Brace Road - west of Barton Road	2	1,800	0.08
Swetzer Road - north of King Road	2	4,900	0.21
Humphrey Road - north of King Road	2	2,000	0.09

Table CIRC-2. Existing Peak Hour Intersection Operations

Intersection	Control	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
Taylor Road/Oak Street	1-way Stop	< 5.0	A	< 5.0	A
Taylor Road/Walnut Street	2-way Stop	< 5.0	A	< 5.0	A
Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road	Signal	21.8	C	13.8	B
Taylor Road/Webb Street	2-way Stop	< 5.0	A	< 5.0	A
Taylor Road/King Road	Signal	30.9	D	22.9	C
King Road/Webb Street	2-way Stop	< 5.0	A	< 5.0	A
King Road/Sierra College Boulevard	2-way Stop	< 5.0	A	< 5.0	A
Taylor Road/Sierra College Road	Signal	16.9	C	18.4	C
I-80 WB Ramps/Horseshoe Bar Road	Signal	15.4	C	17.5	C
I-80 EB Ramps/Horseshoe Bar Road	1-way Stop	< 5.0	A	6.8	B
I-80 WB Ramps/Sierra College Blvd.	Signal	24.3	C	22.8	C
I-80 EB Ramps/Sierra College Blvd.	Signal	12.7	B	21.7	C

The presence of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks limits access between northwest Loomis and the downtown area. At-grade crossings are currently provided at King Road, Webb Street, and Sierra College Boulevard. Union Pacific Railroad representatives and the Loomis Fire Protection District are concerned about the close spacing (about 1,000 feet) of the railroad crossings at Webb Street and King Road. Given that trains frequently exceed 1,000 feet in length, it is possible that a slow moving or stopped train could simultaneously block the Webb Street and King Road at-grade crossings. The primary connections between southeast Loomis and the downtown area (i.e., across I-80) are Horseshoe Bar Road and Brace Road. These two roads have narrow travel lanes and little or no paved shoulders, which limits travel speeds for emergency vehicles.

Bus Service. Public bus service is provided to the Loomis area by Placer County Transit. The Loomis-Penryn Shuttle interconnects Loomis, Penryn, Lincoln, and Sierra College in Rocklin. This route has stops within Loomis at Taylor Road/King Road, Flag Stop (at Stahr Liquor Store), Del Oro High School, and Raleys. Service is provided between 6:30 AM and 4:15 PM Monday through Friday with four stops per day. Loomis is also served by the Auburn-Roseville Express Shuttle, which runs from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 10:00 AM to 6 PM on Saturday. This service operates with one-hour headways (the time between bus pick-ups/drop-offs).

Bicycle/Pedestrian System. The existing bicycle system consists of a series of Class I (off-street trails) and Class II (on-street lanes with guide signs and pavement marking) bike lanes on major arterials. A Class I bike trail exists on the south side of Taylor Road between King Road and Del Oro High School. A short portion of King Road east of Bankhead Road also features a Class I bike trail. Class II bike lanes are provided on the following roadways:

- Sierra College Boulevard (both sides) between Granite Drive and Del Mar Avenue;
- Taylor Road (both sides) between Sierra College Boulevard and Oak Street;
- Taylor Road (south side) between Oak Street and Webb Street; and
- King Road between Sierra College Boulevard and I-80.

Pedestrian facilities are located sporadically throughout the Loomis area. Sidewalks are provided on sections of Sierra College Boulevard, King Road, Taylor Road, Horseshoe Bar Road, and Swetzer Road, generally in locations where development has occurred. Crosswalks are provided at the four signalized intersections in Loomis and at numerous other unsignalized locations throughout the Town.

Rail Service. Existing train traffic through Loomis uses two tracks: westbound traffic uses the tracks adjacent to Taylor Road, while eastbound traffic uses the tracks near Sierra College Boulevard. Switching improvements may eventually be made in the Loomis area so that passenger rail service will use the Taylor Road tracks for both directions of travel. The historic train station at the terminus of Horseshoe Bar Road is a possible location for future passenger service. The existing Capitol Corridor train service provides seven trains per day in each direction between Sacramento and San Jose. One train per day in each direction continues east from Sacramento with stops in Roseville, Rocklin, and Auburn. In the future, passenger rail service may be expanded to include Loomis and Newcastle. The regional California Zephyr travels between Chicago and San Jose, passing once daily in each direction through Loomis.

Existing Deficiencies. Existing deficiencies of the roadway, bicycle/pedestrian systems are identified and displayed in Table CIRC-3. A review of the transit and rail systems did not reveal any existing deficiencies.

Table CIRC-3. Existing Deficiencies

Facility	Description of Deficiency
Roadways	
Taylor Road through the downtown area	Existing traffic volumes are near the capacity of the road through the downtown area. Travel speeds through downtown are also perceived as excessive by many for pedestrian/bicycle safety.
Taylor Road east of the downtown	Poor pavement condition and narrow travel lanes and shoulders results in difficult driving conditions.
Horseshoe Bar Road between I-80 and Taylor Road	Existing traffic volumes are near the capacity of the road.
Horseshoe Bar Road south of I-80	Sharp curves and narrow travel lanes and shoulders results in difficult driving conditions.
Bankhead Road and Barton Road	Narrow travel lanes and little or no paved shoulders result in difficult driving conditions.
Intersections	
Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road Intersection	Significant delays occur on three of the four approaches due to heavy traffic volumes and inefficient signal timing.
Taylor Road/King Road Intersection	Significant delays occur in the morning when school is in session. Insufficient turn lane storage contributes to delays.
Sierra College Boulevard/Brace Road Intersection	Lack of left-turn bays on Sierra College Boulevard and a traffic signal results in operational problems and safety concerns.
Bicycle/Pedestrian System	
Taylor Road through the downtown area	The striping for the Class II bicycle lane is weathered and difficult to see. The Class II bicycle lane on the north side of Taylor Road terminates at Oak Street creating a gap to King Road.
Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, King Road, and Horseshoe Bar Road	Sidewalks are discontinuous throughout Taylor Road, King Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and Horseshoe Bar Road.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. Buildout under the proposed project would affect roadway operations and traffic patterns. Based on a combination of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the Town of Loomis General Plan and the Placer County General Plan, impacts would be significant if the project would:

- *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;*

- *Cause a degradation of intersections to below LOS C, the minimum level considered acceptable by the General Plan Update;*
- *Cause roadways segments to degrade to a volume-capacity ration less than 0.80, with the magnitude of degradation being at least 0.05;*
- *Impact existing circulation patterns through partial or full street closures;*
- *Restrict movement of emergency vehicles without alternative access routes;*
- *Interfere with traffic in residential neighborhoods, including bicycle or pedestrian circulation;*
- *Create secondary impacts with respect to biology, land use, or noise related to the construction of onsite access roads; or*
- *Degrade the road surface.*

Key Issues. The following key issues related to circulation were identified during the preparation of the General Plan Update. These are the basis for determining potential impacts with respect to future development under the General Plan Update.

- *Growth in traffic volumes from development within, and adjacent to, the Town will cause increased congestion and need for roadway improvements, depending upon the chosen service level standard.*

- *Many roadway improvements will be needed during the life of the General Plan and design standards are needed to ensure consistency and quality.*

- *Bicycle facilities are limited in Loomis. Provisions to increase bicycle use will provide recreational and mobility benefits to residents and reduce vehicular traffic.*

- *Transit service is limited within the Town, providing little incentive for its use and limited options for transit-dependent persons.*

- *Increased development within, and adjacent to the Town, creates possibility for traffic intrusion into residential neighborhoods.*

- *Transportation improvements are expensive and the Town has very limited financial resources.*

- *Financial constraints can lead to improper maintenance, which reduces the quality and longevity of facilities.*

Potential Impacts. Based on the key issues identified above, the following are considered potentially significant traffic impacts:

- The potential for substandard roadway and intersection operations following proposed roadway modifications at General Plan buildout;
- Increased roadway safety impacts from increased traffic, particularly in residential areas;
- The provision of alternative modes of transportation to serve the community; and
- The provision of adequate funding to implement the needed physical roadway improvements.

Proposed Roadway Modifications Under the General Plan Update. The General Plan includes several modifications to the Town's existing circulation system in order to accommodate potential growth. The following circulation changes are assumed under the proposed General Plan:

- Widen Sierra College Boulevard to 6 lanes north of I-80 (to Bankhead);
- Reconstruct the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard interchange;
- Widen I-80 from a 6-lane to an 8-lane freeway east and west of Horseshoe bar Road;
- Install bike lanes on Taylor Road from Midas Avenue (in Rocklin) to Sierra College Boulevard, and from King Road to the Loomis Town Limits; and
- Provide passenger rail service to Loomis.

Note that most of these improvements will depend on the cooperation of outside agencies, including the City of Rocklin, Caltrans, AMTRAK, and the Union Pacific Railroad. The following Town-specific roadway modifications are anticipated under the updated Circulation Element, and are intended to respond to future development or specific concerns raised during the General Plan Update preparation process:

- Swetzer Road extension (from King Road to Sierra College Boulevard);
- Boyington Road extension (freeway frontage road from King Road to Horseshoe Bar Road);
- Various functional improvements to Taylor Road in the downtown core;
- Widen Sierra College Boulevard to 4 lanes north of Bankhead;
- Widen Horseshoe Bar Road to 4 lanes, from Boyington Road extension (near I-80) to southern boundary of commercial property south of I-80; and
- Widen Rocklin Road to 4 lanes from Sierra College Boulevard to Barton Road.

With the exception of the last improvement, all are located entirely within Loomis. The widening of Rocklin Road to Sierra College Boulevard would require the cooperation of the agencies through which the roadway extends beyond the Loomis town limit.

Post-Improvement Impacts at Town Buildout. Full buildout under the General Plan Update would increase the Town's population by an estimated 70%, or about 4,300 new residents. In combination with cumulative development in the region, this represents about 155,000 new daily automobile trips to distribute on the roadway network. However, this increase in traffic is largely a result of development outside the Town, particularly in areas such as Lincoln and Rocklin. Proposed development in Lincoln, for example, would account for the vast majority of new traffic on Sierra College Boulevard north of Interstate 80. Lincoln and the County would be equal contributors, unless the County would contribute more based on the traffic patterns associated with the Bickford Ranch project.

Town-related traffic increases, in combination with cumulative increases in traffic associated with regional growth, would result in an overall increase in traffic levels throughout the Town. Most affected by general increases in traffic associated with buildout within the existing Town limits would be Sierra College Boulevard and Taylor Road, as well as Interstate 80.

Impacts Due to Regional (Cumulative) Growth. Future (2020) baseline conditions assume buildout of the 2000 General Plan Update and projected development in surrounding communities through 2020. It also assumes the following transportation improvements (as listed in the 1996 Draft Placer County Regional Transportation Plan):

- *Widen Sierra College Boulevard to six lanes north of I-80;*
- *Reconstruct the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard interchange;*
- *Widen I-80 from a six-lane to an eight-lane freeway east and west of Horseshoe Bar Road;*
- *Install bicycle lanes on Taylor Road from Midas Avenue (in Rocklin) to Sierra College Boulevard and from King Road to the Loomis Town Limits; and*
- *Attempt to provide passenger rail service in Loomis.*

The City of Rocklin 2020 traffic model, which covers the entire Sacramento region, was utilized to obtain future traffic forecasts because this model contains more zonal and roadway network detail than the other available models (SACMET, PCTPA models). The future land uses within Loomis were modified to reflect buildout of the 2000 Loomis General Plan Update.

These totals represent an approximate 70 percent increase over the existing housing supply (estimated to be 2,275 units in 1996 based on Department of Finance and Census data) and a substantial increase in the amount of commercial uses (based on the base year (1992) traffic model). The vast majority of the increase in commercial square footage is expected to occur within the downtown area.

Figure 9 displays the average daily travel demands for Year 2020 conditions. Sierra College Boulevard is projected to carry between 17,100 vehicles per day south of King Road to 40,500 vehicles per day near the southern Town limits. This is an approximate three-fold increase over existing traffic that is primarily attributable to new developments, such as Twelve Bridges, Whitney Oaks, and Clover Valley Lakes planned in the surrounding communities. Traffic volumes on Taylor Road will range from about 11,500 vehicles per day near the north Town limits to about 18,200 vehicles per day through the downtown area. Traffic volumes on King Road, Swetzer Road, Webb Street, Barton Road, Laird Road, and Brace Road are expected to range from 2,500 to 11,400 vehicles per day.

Table CIRC-4 summarizes the daily volume-to-capacity ratio for the major roadways **assuming no physical improvements**. This table shows that projected volumes will exceed the capacity on the segments of Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and Horseshoe Bar Road if these roads are not improved.

Figure 9. Projected Traffic Volumes at Buildout
(from Circulation Element Figure 3)

Table CIRC-4.
Future Roadway Segment Operations at Cumulative Buildout (before improvements)

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions		Future Conditon[2]	
	ADT	Daily V/C Ratio[1]	ADT	Daily V/C Ratio[1]
Sierra College Blvd. - north of King Road	6,100	0.27	25,000	1.09
Sierra College Blvd. - between King Road and Bankhead Road	5,400	0.24	19,100	0.83
Sierra College Blvd. - between Bankhead Road and Taylor Road	9,300	0.41	36,300	1.59
Sierra College Blvd. - between Taylor Road and I-80 (within the City of Rocklin)	12,300	0.54	48,300	2.11
Sierra College Blvd. - between Rocklin Rd. and Ridge Park Dr. (within the City of Rocklin)	14,400	0.63	44,800	1.96
Taylor Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and Horseshoe Bar	10,500	0.70	23,100	1.54
Taylor Rd. - between Horseshoe Bar Road and King Road	13,800	0.92	17,800	1.19
Taylor Rd. - east of King Road	6,100	0.41	11,700	0.78
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Taylor Road and Magnolia Ave.	10,400	0.69	17,300	1.15
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Magnolia Avenue and I-80	12,600	0.84	19,800	1.32
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between I-80 and Brace Road	5,300	0.23	17,100	0.75
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - east of Oak Tree Lane	3,500	0.15	4,200	0.18
King Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and Bankhead Road	800	0.05	8,200	0.55
King Rd. - between Arcadia Avenue and Taylor Road	5,300	0.35	12,400	0.83
King Rd. - between Taylor Road and Boyington Road	3,900	0.26	11,700	0.78
Webb Street - between Saunders Avenue and Taylor Road	3,500	0.23	6,700	0.45
Bankhead Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and King Road	3,400	0.23	9,800	0.65
Del Mar Avenue - north of Alvis Court	400	0.03	3,900	0.26
Laird Road - south of High Cliff Road	1,900	0.08	4,900	0.21
Barton Road - south of Brace Road	1,400	0.06	7,300	0.49
Barton Road - north of Rocklin Road	1,700	0.07	7,400	0.49
Rocklin Road - west of Barton Road	4,500	0.20	18,400	0.80
Brace Road - west of Barton Road	1,800	0.08	12,400	0.54
Swetzer Road - north of King Road	4,900	0.33	6,400	0.43
Humphrey Road - north of King Road	2,000	0.13	6,800	0.45

Notes: [1] *V/C Ratio = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio;*
[2] *Assumes no physical improvements within the Town of Loomis.*

Future Deficiencies. Future deficiencies of the roadway, bicycle/pedestrian systems are identified and displayed in Table CIRC-5 assuming no improvements are made. A review of the transit and rail systems did not reveal any future deficiencies.

Table CIRC-5
Primary Future Deficiencies (Without Any Improvements)

Facility	Description of Deficiency
Roadways	
Taylor Road, Horseshoe Bar Road, Sierra College Blvd, and Rocklin Road	Projected traffic volumes will exceed the capacity of these roadways in some or all sections.
Taylor Road (east of King) and King Road	Poor pavement condition, lack of turning lanes, and narrow travel lanes/shoulders will result in difficult driving conditions with increases in traffic volumes.
Horseshoe Bar Road south of Taylor Road	The lack of turning lanes and sidewalks will become more problematic with increases in traffic volumes.
Bankhead Road, Brace Road, Barton Road	Narrow travel lanes and little or no paved shoulders will result in difficult driving conditions with increased traffic volumes.
Intersections	
Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road Intersection	Projected increases in traffic will significantly worsen operations at this intersection.
Taylor Road/King Road Intersection	Projected increases in traffic will significantly worsen operations at this intersection.
Sierra College Boulevard/Taylor Road/Union Pacific	This intersection will become extremely congested with future growth. While widening of Sierra College Boulevard will temporarily relieve the problem, a grade-separation will ultimately be needed.
Bicycle/Pedestrian System	
Bicycle Facilities In-General	Bicycle facilities are sparse throughout the Town, and increased population and popularity of bicycle travel will create the need for additional facilities.
Taylor Road through the downtown area	The striping for the Class II bicycle lane is weathered and difficult to see. The Class II bicycle lane on the north side of Taylor Road terminates at Oak Street creating a gap to King Road.
Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, King Road, and Horseshoe Bar Road	Sidewalks are discontinuous throughout Taylor Road, King Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and Horseshoe Bar Road.

Post-Improvement Conditions. This section discusses transportation modifications proposed under the General Plan Update. These modifications would address existing and future deficiencies expected at cumulative buildout, and are intended to provide adequate roadway capacity. Intersection-specific improvements, either separate from or part of the roadway widenings, will need to be designed for the desired LOS C standard.

Roadway Network. Improvements to the roadway network are intended to address several future problems:

- *Insufficient capacity at several locations to support build-out of the Town and growth in the surrounding communities;*
- *Excess "through" traffic and trucks along Taylor Road through the downtown;*
- *A desire to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment in downtown; and*
- *Safety issues related to vehicular traffic.*

A focused study was conducted by the Town of Loomis in 1997 (*Downtown Loomis Parking and Circulation Study*, Fehr & Peers Associates) to address parking and circulation conditions along Taylor Road and a portion of Horseshoe Bar Road. This study evaluated several alternatives that were intended to reduce traffic congestion, improve truck circulation, enhance pedestrian/bicycle circulation and safety, and improve parking.

The 1997 downtown study used a combination of engineering analysis and public input to identify a preferred circulation system. The public input consisted of:

- *a Technical Advisory Committee that provided general guidance;*
- *extensive public opinion surveys;*
- *two public workshops; and*
- *a joint workshop of the Economic Development Commission, Planning Commission, and Town Council.*

The primary elements of the preferred circulation system from the 1997 study are as follows, and shown in detail in the proposed Circulation Element as well as the Technical Appendix of this EIR:

Swetzer Road Extension– is the construction of a two-lane roadway from Taylor Road to Sierra College Boulevard immediately north of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. This improvement would be largely within the railroad right-of-way in an area that cannot be developed with buildings due to its proximity to the tracks. An at-grade crossing would be provided near Circle Drive if, and when, the existing at-grade crossing at Webb Street is removed as a requirement of Union Pacific or as a negotiated item.

Boyington Road Extension – is the construction of a two-lane freeway frontage road from King Road to Horseshoe Bar Road north of the Raley's Shopping Center, with a short extension to connect with Walnut Street.

Miscellaneous Core Improvements – consists of a series of localized improvements on Taylor Road that are designed to improve local circulation and parking. Some of the key elements include:

- *visual gateways on Taylor Road that all serve a traffic calming function;*
- *modifications to the Horseshoe Bar/Taylor intersection to provide an "uninterrupted" right-turn from Horseshoe Bar Road to Taylor Road;*
- *a one-way circulation system to/from the new train depot with on-street parking, bus turnout, and drop-off facility;*

- *a pedestrian/local traffic only facility adjacent to the fruit sheds (between Walnut Street and Horseshoe Bar Road);*
- *continuous bike lane on Taylor Road throughout the downtown; and*
- *new traffic signals on Taylor road at Webb Street, Walnut Avenue, and Circle Drive.*

The Technical Appendix for the EIR and the proposed Circulation Element show additional improvements anticipated to be necessary with buildout of the 2000 General Plan Update. Most of the improvements are safety and/or operational related (such as providing paved shoulders, turning lanes, or signals). However, a few facilities will need additional through lanes for capacity:

- *Sierra College Boulevard – 4 lanes north of Bankhead Road and 6 lanes south of Bankhead Road.*
- *Horseshoe Bar Road – 4 lanes from Boyington Road Extension to Brace Road.*
- *Rocklin Road – 4 lanes from Sierra College Boulevard to Barton Road.*

King Road should be improved to provide turning lanes at major cross-streets, curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The portion of Horseshoe Bar Road between Taylor Road and the Boyington Road Extension should also be improved to provide a continuous turn lane along with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Taylor Road (east of King Road) should be improved to provide turning lanes at major cross-streets and curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

The Sierra College Boulevard interchange will need to be widened and improved, and a grade-separation will be needed at the confluence of Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, and the Union Pacific Railroad.

Some widening of the Taylor Road/King Road intersection will likely be needed depending upon the enrollment and operation of the adjacent Loomis Grammar School and Del Oro High School. Brace Road, Barton Road, and Bankhead Road will all warrant upgrades that provide for standard lane widths and paved shoulders.

Several intersections will likely warrant signalization and/or turning lanes. Figure 6 within the Technical Appendix shows some of the more likely locations, but the identified locations are neither definitive nor exhaustive.

Residents have been concerned about "through" traffic on Del Mar Avenue and the incentives for additional through traffic will increase as travel times increase on Sierra College Boulevard and Taylor Road. In response, the Town should create a discontinuity on Del Mar Avenue in the form of back-to-back cul-del-sacs near the mid-point. The design should allow for continued pedestrian, bicycle, and emergency access.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities. The following are the recommended bicycle facility improvements (Technical Appendix Figure 7) to complement or upgrade the existing system:

- Provide westbound on-street bike lane (Class II) on Taylor Road from King Road to Oak Street to match existing eastbound facility;

- Provide on-street (Class II) facilities on Taylor Road (from King Road to eastern Town Limits and Sierra College Boulevard to western Town Limits), Sierra College Boulevard (within entire Town Limits), Rocklin Road (within entire Town Limits); and

- Provide on-street (Class III) facilities on Bankhead Road (King to Sierra College), Saunders Avenue (Bankhead to eastern limit), South Walnut/Shore, Brace Road, and Laird Road. In most cases, these facilities will consist of paved shoulders and appropriate signage.

The sidewalks should be made continuous along Taylor Road, Sierra College Boulevard, King Road, and Horseshoe Bar Road. The policy section of the circulation element provides a description of the Town's policy regarding sidewalks on new roadways. The high traffic volumes on Sierra College Boulevard could pose a safety hazard to pedestrians crossing this roadway, an impact that could be addressed by a pedestrian overcrossing, if deemed feasible after further review.

Transit Service. Only one capital improvement is planned with respect to transit; namely, the revitalization of the rail station near Horseshoe Bar Road and Taylor Road. Improvements to the platform, station, circulation, and parking facilities are desirable. Figure 5A of the Technical Appendix shows the conceptual circulation system. While passenger rail service is not imminent, this facility will become a future "hub" of transit service (both rail and bus) in Loomis.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The improvements listed above are part of the proposed Circulation Element, and collectively would reduce potential physical circulation impacts to a less than significant level. The Draft Circulation Element also includes the following policies intended to implement the proposed physical improvements previously described:

- **Policy CE (Level of Service)-1.** In order to minimize congestion, maintain Level of Service C on all intersections within the Town of Loomis. Exceptions to this standard are allowed when:

  1. The deficiency is substantially caused by "through" traffic, which neither begins nor ends in Loomis, and is primarily generated by non-residents; or

  2. The deficiency will be temporary (less than three years), and a fully-funded plan is in place to provide the improvements needed to remedy the substandard condition.

- **Policy CE (Roadway Improvement)-1.** Roadway improvements within the Town of Loomis shall conform to the roadway classification system and improvement standards specified in the current version of the *Town of Loomis Design & Improvement Standards*..

- **Policy CE (Bicycle Facility)-1.** The Town shall promote bicycle travel, as appropriate, and shall pursue all available sources of funding for the development and improvement of bicycle facilities.

- **Policy CE (Bicycle Facility)-2.** Bicycle facilities shall be provided in compliance with the *Placer County Bikeways Master Plan* (Placer County Transportation Commission, 1988) or subsequent amended versions of that document, as well as on other appropriate routes at the discretion of the Town Council.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service)-1.** The Town will promote and support a safe, efficient, and coordinated public transit system that meets residents' needs, reduces congestion, improves the environment, and helps provide a viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through the Town of Loomis.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service)-2.** The Town should work with Placer County Transit and other transit providers to plan and implement public transportation services within the Town that are timely, cost-effective, and responsive to growth patterns and transit demand.

  a. Transit routes should conform to plans established by Placer County Transit, and should generally coincide with major destinations for employment and shopping, the location of major institutions, concentrations of multifamily housing, and other land uses likely to attract public transit ridership.

  b. Bus routes should follow major roads with service to residential neighborhoods via collector streets.

  c. Bus stops should be located in conformance with the applicable policies of Placer County Transit.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service)-3.** The Town should consider the transit needs of senior, disabled, minority, low-income, and transit-dependent persons in making decisions regarding transit services and in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

- **Policy CE (Transit Service)-4.** The Town should support efforts to provide demand-responsive service ("paratransit") and other transportation services for those unable to use conventional transit.

- **Policy CE (Neighborhood Environment)-1.** The Town shall create and maintain a street system which protects residential neighborhoods from unnecessary levels of traffic, while providing for logical traffic circulation.

- **Policy CE (Neighborhood Environment)-2.** The Town shall design streets and approve development applications in such a manner as to prevent and eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.

- **Policy CE (Neighborhood Environment)-3.** The Town shall promote the development of a circulation system that preserves the historic nature and character of neighborhoods and districts, and reinforces neighborhood identity and integrity.

- **Policy CE (Neighborhood Environment)-4.** New local streets shall be designed to promote the interconnection of residential neighborhoods while simultaneously discouraging through-traffic within residential neighborhoods.

- **Policy CE (Neighborhood Environment)-5.** The Town of Loomis shall establish and maintain a procedure through which local residents can receive assistance in managing and reducing traffic flows through their residential neighborhoods. Such assistance could be technical, the provision of equipment (such as signs) and the labor needed to install such equipment, or provision of enhanced police traffic enforcement in neighborhoods. The Town could also participate in modifying the existing street system to reduce or eliminate through traffic intrusion into residential neighborhoods. Based on the identified need and available financing, priorities will be established and an appropriate level of resources (including staff time, equipment, and physical improvements) will be committed by the Town.

- **Policy CE (Roadway System Funding)-1.** The Town shall aggressively pursue state and federal funding to implement the primary elements of the Town's Circulation Plan.

- **Policy CE (Roadway System Funding)-2.** The Town shall require proposed new development projects to analyze their contribution to increased vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic and to implement the roadway improvements necessary to address their impact.

- **Policy CE (Roadway System Funding)-3.** The Town shall assess fees on new development sufficient to cover the fair share portion of development's cumulative impacts on the local and regional transportation system.

- **Policy CE (Roadway System Funding)-4.** Prior to acceptance of new local streets by the Town, provisions shall be made for the ongoing maintenance of those facilities. Such provisions could include the establishment of a maintenance district covering the specific roadways identified, or assumption of all maintenance responsibilities by the pertinent homeowners association or other approved organization.

- **Policy CE (Roadway Maintenance)-1.** The Town shall assure that the transportation system continues to provide safe, efficient, and convenient access to its residents.

- **Policy CE (Roadway Maintenance)-2.** The Town shall provide dependable and adequate resources to maintain and repair the existing system of roads and bridges, according to priorities established within the capital improvement program.

- **Policy CE (Roadway Maintenance)-3.** The Town shall work with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to ensure that the PCTPA's Regional

Transportation Plan is coordinated with the Town's Capital Improvement Plan. This coordination will allow access to Federal and State funds, where possible, for road maintenance and improvements.

In addition to these policies, the following additional policy is recommended to address a potential pedestrian safety impact on Sierra College Boulevard:

- **Additional Policy CIRC-1.** If recommended by the Town Engineer after review, and if determined to be feasible, the Town should pursue the construction of a pedestrian bridge over Sierra College Boulevard to address safety impacts. The precise location of such a crossing would be determined after further review.

Residual Impacts

Implementation of the Draft Circulation Element policies, in combination with the specific roadway improvements contained in the Draft Circulation Element, would be expected to mitigate the traffic impacts of future development in the Town. Development of specific road improvements to mitigate the impacts of future development proposals would not be appropriate at this time. Specific improvements will need to be developed as needed in conjunction with future development plans. Table CIRC-6 shows roadway operations following proposed circulation improvements.

As noted on Table CIRC-6, proposed roadway modifications would improve road operations with cumulative buildout, most dramatically on Sierra College Boulevard. However, some Town roadways would likely continue to experience significant congestion (> 0.80 V/C)) at buildout, most notably as shown below:

- Taylor Road (between Sierra College Boulevard and Horseshoe Bar Road),
- Horseshoe Bar Road (between Taylor and Magnolia);
- King Road (between Arcadia and Taylor); and

In addition, two other roadway segments would experience congestion greater than 0.80 V/C, even with proposed improvements:

- Sierra College Boulevard (Taylor to I-80, in Rocklin);
- Sierra College Boulevard (Rocklin Road to Ridge Park Drive, in Rocklin)

In the case of the Sierra College Boulevard segments, proposed roadway modifications would greatly improve the operation of this road as development occurs, but some congestion would nevertheless remain.

Table CIRC-6. Cumulative Roadway Segment Operations (With Improvements)

Roadway Segment	Future Conditon[2]		Future Condition w/ GP Improvements	
	ADT	Daily V/C Ratio[1]	ADT	Daily V/C Ratio[1]
Sierra College Blvd. - north of King Road	25,000	1.09	26,000	0.72
Sierra College Blvd. - between King Road and Bankhead Road	19,100	0.83	19,900	0.55
Sierra College Blvd. - between Bankhead Road and Taylor Road	36,300	1.59	35,000	0.65
Sierra College Blvd. - between Taylor Road and I-80 (within the City of Rocklin)	48,300	2.11	49,600	0.92
Sierra College Blvd. - between Rocklin Rd. and Ridge Park Dr. (within the City of Rocklin)	44,800	1.96	45,500	0.84
Taylor Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and Horseshoe Bar	23,100	1.54	18,400	1.23
Taylor Rd. - between Horseshoe Bar Road and King Road	17,800	1.19	12,200	0.81
Taylor Rd. - east of King Road	11,700	0.78	11,900	0.79
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Taylor Road and Magnolia Ave.	17,300	1.15	18,000	1.20
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between Magnolia Avenue and I-80	19,800	1.32	21,200	0.71
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - between I-80 and Brace Road	17,100	0.75	17,800	0.59
Horseshoe Bar Rd. - east of Oak Tree Lane	4,200	0.18	4,300	0.19
King Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and Bankhead Road	8,200	0.55	7,700	0.51
King Rd. - between Arcadia Avenue and Taylor Road	12,400	0.83	14,400	0.96
King Rd. - between Taylor Road and Boyington Road	11,700	0.78	9,900	0.66
Webb Street - between Saunders Avenue and Taylor Road	6,700	0.45	4,000	0.26
Bankhead Rd. - between Sierra College Blvd. and King Road	9,800	0.65	9,500	0.63
Del Mar Avenue - north of Alvis Court	3,900	0.26	3,900	0.26
Laird Road - south of High Cliff Road	4,900	0.21	4,900	0.21
Barton Road - south of Brace Road	7,300	0.49	7,300	0.49
Barton Road - north of Rocklin Road	7,400	0.49	7,400	0.49
Rocklin Road - west of Barton Road	18,400	0.80	19,200	0.64
Brace Road - west of Barton Road	12,400	0.54	12,400	0.54
Swetzer Road - north of King Road	6,400	0.43	6,400	0.43
Humphrey Road - north of King Road	6,800	0.45	6,800	0.45

Notes: [1] *V/C Ratio = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio. Significant impacts would be 0.81 V/C or greater.*
[2] *Assumes no physical improvements within the Town of Loomis.*

Although the proposed General Plan Update does not include a standard for roadway operations, it may be concluded that the above-listed roadways would operate at experience substantial congestion, based on their volume-capacity ratios shown in Table CIRC-6. It is expected that traffic impacts along these roadways would remain significant and unavoidable, even with proposed improvements. At all other roadways, and at area intersections, it is expected that impacts could be reduced to less than significant levels as development occurs.

3.12 UTILITIES (Solid Waste, Wastewater, Electricity and Gas)

Setting

This section discusses impacts to various utilities, with the exception of water resources. Impacts involving this resource are discussed in section *3.7 Hydrology*, which discusses flood hazards and water resources.

Solid Waste Management. The Auburn Placer Disposal Service (APDS) provides solid waste disposal for the planning area. If households elect to subscribe to the service, each is provided with a 90-gallon container for weekly collection of domestic refuse. APDS places a 180-pound weight limit for refuse within these containers. At this time, subscription to APDS is not mandatory.

APDS estimates that individual households produce about 100 pounds of solid waste per week (Town of Loomis, *Heritage Park Estates Draft EIR*, 1998). This estimate is somewhat higher than that of the Placer County Solid Waste Management Plan, which estimates about 3.5 pounds per person per day, or about 65 pounds per household per week. However, it is substantially lower than the results suggested by a recent survey in Rocklin, which indicates a per capita disposal rate of 9 pounds per day, or about 164 pounds per week per household.

Solid waste is ultimately taken to the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) in western Placer County at the intersection of Athens Avenue and Fiddyment Road. The landfill is managed by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority, which consists of representatives from Rocklin, Lincoln, Roseville, and Placer County. The 800-acre landfill has been operating since 1979.

A materials recovery facility (MRF) at the WRSL was opened in 1995. The facility currently has a 750-ton capacity per 8-hour shift, and processes an average of 600 tons per day (Smith, 1996). The facility is expandable to handle up to 2,000 tons per day with a 16-hour shift, with a 20% guaranteed minimum recovery rate. The MRF would eventually include a compacted residential waste tipping area and recyclables drop-off/buy back center.

Currently, recyclable materials are co-mingled with household garbage or collected in "blue bags" and transported to the MRF. In accordance with AB 939, recyclables are sorted from the refuse, and the residual is transferred to the landfill. With the introduction of the MRF, the effective lifespan of the WRSL is estimated at 75 years (Dominguez, 1997).

The Placer County Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) was approved in 1994, pursuant to the requirements of AB 939. The SRRE describes the existing waste stream, evaluates reduction and recycling alternatives, and indicates how the county will divert 50% of solid waste from its landfills and incinerators by 2000.

Wastewater. About half of the planning area is connected to wastewater collection infrastructure, a service provided by the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD). North of Interstate 80, the Town is served by sewer lines ranging from 6 to 12 inches in diameter. The primary service line is a 15-inch pipe near Taylor Road, known as the Lower

Loomis Trunk Sewer. South of the freeway, the Middle Secret Ravine Trunk extends to Barton Road and a tributary pipe network serves portions of the community in this area.

The SPMUD Sewer Master Plan (1986) identifies the need for an 18-inch Middle Antelope Creek Trunk Sewer to serve future development in the western portion of the community. SPMUD would extend this trunk northward along the general alignment of Antelope Creek as growth requires. This plan would be most easily implemented if growth occurred from south to north along this corridor, so infrastructure could be extended logically. Otherwise, development would have to pay all costs associated with the extension of sewer infrastructure.

The trunk sewer system collects wastewater from residential and commercial uses and transports it to the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (RRWWTP). The RRWWTP currently treats an inflow of about 13 million gallons per day (mgd), and was recently expanded to accommodate up to 18 mgd.

Electricity and Gas. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) supplies natural gas and electricity to homes and businesses in Loomis. These services are provided in accordance with Public Utilities Commission (PUC) rules and regulations. Some rural locations on the periphery of the community are not connected to the existing gas distribution network, and are instead on individual propane hookups. This service is currently provided by many private propane providers on an individual basis.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds. Effects to electrical power services would be considered significant if the Town's growth demands exceeds existing or planned capacity or if substantial infrastructure improvements would be required. Effects to gas services would be considered significant if the Town's growth demands exceeded existing or planned capacity or if substantial infrastructure improvements would be required. A significant impact would occur if the Town's growth exceeds the waste hauler's existing or planned capacity to dispose of the refuse. Another significant impact would occur if the existing landfills could not adequately serve the additional refuse. Impacts on the sewer system are considered significant if sewage generated by the Town's growth will exceed the existing or planned capacity of the sewage collection or treatment system, or require extension of a trunk line with capacity to serve new development.

Key Issues. The following is the only issue raised in the proposed General Plan Update that relates to the provision of public utilities:

- *·Many non-residential and rural residential lots on the periphery of the Town use septic systems and well water. Increasing development under these conditions may degrade ground water quality.*

Potential Impacts. Based in part on the key issue described above, the following would be considered potential impacts affecting the community:

- Buildout would require expansion of existing landfill facilities;

- Buildout would require expansion of the existing wastewater treatment plant; and
- Buildout would hamper the ability of electricity and gas service providers to provide service.

Solid Waste. Based upon a rate of 100 pounds of solid waste generated per household per week (Town of Loomis, *Heritage Park Estates Draft EIR*, 1998), buildout of the General Plan Update would be expected to generate an additional 4,240 tons of solid waste annually. Buildout under the General Plan Update, in conjunction with regional buildout, could test the capacity of the existing landfill that serves the community. Ultimately, that facility will need to respond to long-term demands through its own long-term expansion plans. In the meantime, continuation of source reduction and recycling programs on new development in the Town would adequately mitigate impacts relating to solid waste disposal. (The Town was at a 42% diversion rate in 1998, and is expected to attain the required 50% diversion rate by 2000.) Because landfill capacity is a finite resource, impacts are considered potentially significant. Proposed expansion of that facility would mitigate the potential impact as development occurs.

Wastewater. Full buildout under the proposed Land Use Element would add an estimated 1,631 residences. Based on residential wastewater generation rates typically used in the community (400 gpd per dwelling; Town of Loomis, *Heritage Park Estates EIR*, 1998), this amount of new development would generate an estimated 0.65 million gallons per day (mgd) of sewage, which is within the available capacity of 18 mgd. However, about 13.5 mgd are already being used regionwide to serve existing development, leaving about 4.5 mgd available for all future growth (Stein, personal communication, March 2000). A large portion of this remaining capacity is expected to be used by neighboring communities, including Rocklin and Roseville. Although Loomis would contribute a relatively small portion of the future demand, the projected increase would be raise the total community-wide wastewater generated from about 0.9 mgd to 1.55 mgd.

SPMUD is currently in the process of expanding its overall capacity with the new Pleasant Grove Regional Treatment Plant, just east of SR 65, which will add an another 12 mgd to the existing capacity. The expansion, which will be completed in 2002, will increase SPMUD's total capacity to about 30.5 mgd. Future development in Loomis was considered in the master plan that contemplated the expansion, so it is expected that SPMUD will have sufficiency capacity for the Town's buildout (Stein, personal communication, March 2000). Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Electricity and Gas. Additional development that would be accommodated under the proposed General Plan Update would increase Townwide energy demand but would not be expected to require the development of new sources of energy or use energy in a wasteful manner. New homes and other future developments are expected to incorporate energy efficient designs, in accordance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. PG&E expects to be providing service to the region for the duration of the General Plan Update. No significant impacts to energy resources are anticipated.

Development that would be accommodated under the proposed General Plan Update would increase demand for electrical power and gas by about 70%, to serve a population that would increase by about 4,300. PG&E is expected to be able to provide this level of service increase,

which is relatively small compared to expected regional growth. Infill development within the existing Town limit would receive electrical service from existing power lines.. No significant impacts to electrical power and gas service are anticipated.

Proposed Policies That Mitigate Potential Impacts. The following proposed General Plan policies would mitigate potential impacts related to the provision of utilities:

- **Policy PF (Public Facilities) 1.** Loomis will work toward achieving and maintaining acceptable levels of municipal services, including public safety, roadway maintenance, and administrative services. Loomis will cooperate with regional public service agencies to attain adequate service levels for water distribution, sewerage services, flood management, and solid waste collection.

- **Policy PF (Public Facilities) 2.** Non-residential and higher density residential development shall not be expanded into areas lacking public services infrastructure until existing vacant land with these services within the Town limits is utilized, or proposed development ensures the extension of necessary infrastructure through actual construction or payment of fees.

- **Policy PF (Public Facilities) 4.** Proposed development shall be connected to public water supply and sewage disposal systems as follows:
  a. All development proposed in nonresidential land use designations shall be connected to the community water supply and sewage disposal systems prior to occupancy.
  b. Residential development proposed on parcels of 2.2 acres or less shall be connected to the community water supply and sewage disposal systems prior to occupancy.

- **Policy PF (Public Facilities) 5.** Loomis shall work with the solid waste collector (Auburn Placer Disposal Service) in developing a recycling program for Loomis residents.

In addition to these policies, the following additional policies are recommended to be added to the General Plan Update:

- **Additional Policy U-1.** The Town should support source reduction and recycling efforts through the use of recycled products in all Town departments, whenever economically and technically feasible.

- **Additional Policy U-2.** If in the future adequate landfill space cannot be found to meet the Town's needs, no new development shall be approved until such time as adequate landfill space is identified.

- **Additional Policy U-3.** New construction and reconstruction/restoration shall consider energy conservation in the selection of building materials, building orientation, and landscaping.

- **Additional Policy U-4.** The Town shall identify the potential for energy conservation measures for the use of renewable energy sources and alternatives to fossil fuels.

- **Additional Policy U-5.** The Town shall actively participate in the energy conservation programs of the local, state, and federal agencies.

- **Additional Policy U-6.** The Town shall consider the use of alternative energy sources for all public facilities.

Residual Impacts

Proposed General Plan policies, in combination with suggested additional policies, would mitigate general impacts to utilities to less than significant levels. Individual projects would still need to be reviewed to determine if their impacts would be significant, particularly as regional development continues.

4.0 LONG-TERM IMPACTS

This section includes the CEQA-required discussions of growth inducing impacts, significant irreversible environmental changes, and ways in which the project may have short-term benefits to the detriment of long-term productivity. Although the primary focus of these discussions is on buildout of the Draft Land Use Element, the analysis considers the overall effects of the entire General Plan Update.

4.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The draft General Plan Update would accommodate up to 1,631 new residences throughout the Town. It is the specific purpose of the draft plan to accommodate orderly economic and population growth in Loomis. Consequently, plan adoption could indirectly induce both population and economic growth in the Town, although the level of growth would depend upon a variety of factors, including the local economy and associated demand for housing in the area.

All development would occur within the existing Town limits, and would not require the extension of roadways or infrastructure into areas that are not already served. As a general consideration, it does not propose development of an intensity or at locations markedly different that would be allowed under the existing General Plan (see Section 5.0, *Alternatives*). In this sense, the plan would also not be considered growth-inducing.

Loomis is located at the fringe of the areas experiencing the most rapid growth in Placer County. Neighboring Rocklin and Lincoln both envision development at a scale far greater than expected in Loomis. In fact, much of the anticipated traffic increases in Loomis can be attributed to future growth in those communities, as well as other nearby communities such as Roseville. Needed roadway improvements in Loomis to maintain acceptable levels of service, particularly on roads such as Sierra College Boulevard, could indirectly affect the timing of development along such roadways. However, the proposed General Plan Update anticipates this growth, all within the existing Town limit, and as such, it is not considered growth-inducing.

4.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES

Policies contained within the Draft General Plan Update would generally mitigate impacts associated with development that would be accommodated under the Draft Land Use Element. As envisioned in the plan, the community would retain its small town character while accommodating limited population growth and encouraging viable economic development. In a general sense, adoption of the draft plan would not be expected to significantly alter the character or environment of the Loomis Basin. In some specific instances, the character of the area could be affected by the removal or alteration of natural features, particularly the removal of oak trees, which provide much of the rural character of the area.

Buildout in accordance with the plan would, however, irreversibly increase the consumption of non-renewable resources such as oil and natural gas, primarily to accommodate new development within the Town.

4.3 SHORT-TERM USES VS. LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The Draft General Plan Update is specifically intended to provide for the planned and orderly development of the Town in order to ensure its long-term productivity. The policies contained in the plan are designed to provide for growth that will allow continued economic prosperity while preserving the overall character of Loomis. Therefore, project implementation would serve to benefit the long-term productivity and sustainability of the community.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126(d) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. Alternatives examined include the CEQA-required "no project" alternative (buildout under the current Land Use Element), an alternative that responds to various citizen requests and staff recommendations, and an alternative that incorporates only the staff recommendations. A fourth alternative represents a maximum development scenario, incorporating additional citizen requests not contemplated during the original stages of updating the General Plan. These are described in more detail below.

5.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 (No Project—Buildout of Existing General Plan)

This alternative would consider adopting no General Plan Update, but instead allowing buildout under the current General Plan. It would not include the new policies contained in the proposed update, but instead would rely on the existing General Plan policies.

Table ALT-1 compares the buildout characteristics of the Existing General Plan with those of the proposed General Plan Update. Note that under the existing plan, residential buildout would be similar to, but slightly less than expected under the proposed project. The existing plan envisions up to 3,769 dwelling units in the Town (supporting 10,138 residents), compared to the proposed plan, which would support up to 3,851 units (a population of 10,359). The existing plan would allow about 70% more dwellings than currently exist, compared to a 73% increase under the proposed plan.

Non-residential development under the existing plan would be substantially less than under the proposed plan. Buildout under the existing plan would allow up to about 2.3 million square feet of commercial development, about 57% of the buildout allowed under the proposed plan. The differences in industrial potential are less; the existing plan would allow up to 1.9 million square feet, about 80% of what could be anticipated under the proposed plan. It should be noted that either plan has adequate non-residential acreage to support anticipated development through 2020, based on expected market absorption rates.

Table ALT-1. Comparison of Existing General Plan Buildout to the Draft General Plan Update

Land Use Type	Existing Condition	Existing Plan Buildout	Proposed Plan Buildout
Residential			
Dwelling Units	2,220	3,769	3,851
Population	6,100	10,138	10,359
Non-Residential (square feet)			
Commercial	300,000	2,300,000	4,100,000
Industrial	500,000	1,900,000	2,400,000
Total	**800,000**	**4,200,000**	**6,500,000**

[a] *From Department of Finance, 1999. Mobile homes are included under "single-family". Population from Crawford Multari Clark and Mohr.*

[b] *Based upon currently vacant land in the Town, at maximum holding capacity. Assumes 25% of all homes in RMH (6-10du/ac) designation would be multi-family. Comm. SF is based on 0.25 FAR; Ind. SF is based on 0.30 FAR.*

Reducing overall buildout as compared to the Draft General Plan Update would incrementally reduce the intensity of impacts in issue areas where impacts are primarily a result of population and employment growth. These include public services, utilities, transportation, and traffic-related air quality and noise. However, the existing general plan would not include the stricter noise control policies of the proposed plan, nor would it include the many transportation improvements or environmental policies envisioned in the proposed plan. Much of the anticipated traffic (and resulting noise impacts) would arise from development outside of Loomis, and the existing plan includes inadequate mitigation for these issues, particularly traffic issues. Consequently, it can be reasonably argued that resulting impacts with respect to those issues would be slightly greater than under the proposed project, even though slightly less traffic would be generated in Loomis.

In addition, the reduction in overall population growth could incrementally reduce impacts relating to geologic processes and hazardous materials. Although project impacts could be mitigated, this alternative's potential impact in each of these areas is considered slightly lower.

The existing plan includes areas where there are land use conflicts, many of which are addressed either by the proposed plan's revised land use pattern, or policies for specific areas. Such areas would include commercial uses near the downtown area, and the future development pattern along Sierra College Boulevard. It is likely that land use impacts under the existing plan would be greater than expected under the proposed plan. For similar reasons, aesthetic impacts under the existing plan would likely be slightly greater as well.

The existing plan would allow development in the same areas as under the proposed plan. It does not include additional open space, in which sensitive resources (biological and cultural resources) could be protected. The physical impacts of development to these resources would likely be similar under this alternative. However, the existing plan does not include adequate policy direction to protect these resources, including setbacks from sensitive riparian areas. Therefore, overall impacts to these resources would be greater under the existing plan.

For similar reasons, the existing plan's impacts with respect to hydrology would be greater than under the proposed plan. Overall development patterns would be similar under the two plans, but the proposed plan includes policy language precluding development in the 100-year flood plain, as well as other measures designed to mitigate potential drainage-related impacts.

5.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 (Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests)

During the development of the currently proposed General Plan Update land use map, several land use changes were recommended by staff, but ultimately not adopted by the General Plan Steering Committee. In most cases, these changes were recommended to address one or more environmental issue, or to minimize potential land use conflicts at a given location. In addition, various citizens requested changes for their own purposes, which were not always environmental in nature.

Collectively, these recommendations and requests form the basis of this project alternative. In summary, this alternative would include all the land use designations shown for the proposed project (see table LU-1, in section *3.8 Land Use*), but would also include the changes noted in Table ALT-2 below, which refers to areas shown in Figure 10. (These changes were originally rejected by the General Plan Steering Committee.) However, the policies included for the proposed project would be the same under this alternative.

Table ALT-2 describes these changes, with their potential to address one or more environmental or land use impacts. Changes that were originally recommended by staff are shown denoted by a map identifier shown in bold type.

Table ALT-2. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
F	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre, with specific policies	This area is located adjacent to development in Rocklin, as well as the St. Francis Woods development in Loomis, which has the same density. The change is intended to transition from the urban densities to the west in Rocklin, and the rural development along Barton Road in Loomis. With policies to ensure clustering of units along the Rocklin side, and appropriate setbacks and landscaping on the Loomis frontages, this change would reduce potential land use conflicts in the area. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
G	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	This area would provide a logical transition from medium density residential (2-6 du/ac) to the east and rural densities (4.6 du/ac) to the west. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
3	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per 2.3 acres	This is a citizen request to allow a 10-acre parcel to be divided into 4 parcels. This change would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by rural density residential uses (4.6 acres/unit). **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; also increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
4	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	This area would provide a logical transition from medium density residential (2-6 du/ac) to the east and rural densities (4.6 du/ac) to the west. Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G (above) and 14, 18, and 21 (below). These changes would correct current land use designations that split some parcels into two designations, and would assist in the utilization of irregularly-shaped parcels. It would also provide an appropriate transition between residential densities, in conjunction with change G above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
6	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per 2.3 acres	This is a citizen request to allow a 5-acre parcel to be divided into 2 parcels. This change would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by rural density residential uses (4.6 acres/unit) **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; also increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

Table ALT-2. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
7	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 2.3 acres to 3 units per acre	This citizen request was not originally recommended by staff, because it conflicts with the core concept , which seeks to concentrate higher intensity uses near the center of town. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; also increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
8	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to smaller parcels	Staff originally recommended this change in conjunction with change F above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
9	Density change from 2.3 ac/du to 0.75-acre parcels	Change is intended to allow a second unit. Staff did not recommend this, noting it was more appropriately addressed through the Zoning Ordinance **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use, as well as issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
10	Change from residential (2.3 ac/du) to Commercial and higher density residential	This is a citizen request that acknowledges a small existing commercial use. Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use*
11	Change from residential (4.6 ac/du) to Commercial or Office	This is a citizen request that Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use*
12	Change from residential (4.6 ac/du) to Commercial or Office	This is a citizen request that Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use*
13	Density change from 4.6 ac/du to 2.6 units per acre	This is a citizen request that Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use, as well as issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
14	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 18 and 21. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
15	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per acre to 10,000 SF lots	Staff originally recommended this change, because a new elementary school site had been acquired by the school district to the north, and that the requested density exists to the east. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

Table ALT-2. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
18	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 14 and 21. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
19	Change from Residential to Commercial on the frontage, and 4 du/ac on the remainder	Staff did not recommend the increased residential density on Sierra College Boulevard because of traffic-related land use and noise concerns. Staff ultimately recommended portions of the site to be changed to Office. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use, Noise*
20	Density change from 4.6 to 1 acre per unit	Although adjacent to St. Francis Woods on the west and the properties discussed in item F above, this 33-acre parcel does not offer the same potential to provide a rural-to-urban transition as area F. The current designation would already allow the site to be subdivided into 7 parcels. Staff did not recommend this change. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
21	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 14 and 18. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
22	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	This is a citizen request would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by rural density residential uses (4.6 acres/unit). **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; also increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
32	Close one end of Del Mar Avenue	This is a citizen request to alleviate potential safety concerns arising from increased traffic from Sierra College Boulevard speeding through the neighborhood as a shortcut. Closing one end of this road could raise emergency access concerns. Staff made no recommendation during the Steering Committee hearings. **Issues Mitigated:** *Traffic-related Land Use (public safety)* **Adverse Impacts:** *Public Services (emergency response)*
33	Density change from 4.6 ac/du to 2.6 units per acre	This is a citizen request that Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use, as well as issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
34	Density change from 2.3 ac/du to 1 unit per acre	Total site area is 4.6 acres in two parcels (1.1 and 3.5 acres). A 1974 percolation test showed porosity and permeability well above County minimums. The site has high groundwater, but the two rear parcels have sufficient area for leach lines. The adjacent property floods, and the area is within the 60-65 dBA noise contour. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Public Services and Geology (groundwater issues); Hydrology and Noise*

Table ALT-2. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations and Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
35	Density change from1 unit per acre to 2 units per acre	Total site area is 2 acres. Possible flooding and soil concerns, which could be exacerbated by higher density. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Geology (soils); Hydrology (flooding)*
36	Density change from1 unit per 2.3 acres to 2 units per acre	Adjacent land uses are lower density than what is requested. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; as well as issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

As shown on Table ALT-2, many of the changes proposed under this alternative would mitigate one or more impacts, particularly land use-related impacts. Some citizen requests, however, would result in adverse land use impacts (changes 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, and 33). In addition, many of the citizen requests are for higher density residential uses than are currently in place, which could result in increased impacts for issues related to population increases, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Increased densities, particularly in areas far from the core of the Town, would likely result in aesthetic impacts greater than expected under the proposed plan.

Impacts related to flooding and geologic processes may be exacerbated by certain changes (notably 34 and 35). However, because development would likely be confined to areas already designated for development, impacts to biological and cultural resources would be largely similar to what is expected under the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts related to hazardous materials would also be similar to what would be expected under the proposed plan.

Figure 10. Land Use Alternatives
(from CMCM)

5.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 (Staff Recommendations Only)

This alternative is similar to the previous alternative, which included a combination of staff recommendations and citizen requests that were ultimately rejected by the General Plan Steering Committee. However, this alternative includes only the changes recommended by staff, which generally coincide with the changes that would mitigate one or more potential impacts. These would be included in combination with the changes suggested under the Proposed Project (see Table LU-1 in section *3.8 Land Use* for a complete description of changes associated with the Proposed Project). The changes specific to this alternative are shown in Table ALT-3 below, which refers to areas shown in Figure 10. As with the previous alternative, the policies included for the proposed project would be the same under this alternative.

Table ALT-3. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations Only

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
F	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre, with specific policies	This area is located adjacent to development in Rocklin, as well as the St. Francis Woods development in Loomis, which has the same density. It is a logical area to transition from the urban densities to the west in Rocklin, and the rural development along Barton Road in Loomis. With policies to ensure clustering of units along the Rocklin side, and appropriate setbacks and landscaping on the Loomis frontages, this change would reduce potential land use conflicts in the area. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
G	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	This area would provide a logical transition from medium density residential (2-6 du/ac) to the east and rural densities (4.6 du/ac) to the west. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
4	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	This area would provide a logical transition from medium density residential (2-6 du/ac) to the east and rural densities (4.6 du/ac) to the west. Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G (above) and 14, 18, and 21 (below). These changes would correct current land use designations that split some parcels into two designations, and would assist in the utilization of irregularly-shaped parcels. It would also provide an appropriate transition between residential densities, in conjunction with change G above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
8	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to smaller parcels	Staff originally recommended this change in conjunction with change F above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
14	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 18 and 21. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

Table ALT-3. Alternative Incorporating Staff Recommendations Only

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
15	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per acre to 10,000 SF lots	Staff originally recommended this change, because a new elementary school site had been acquired by the school district to the north, and that the requested density exists to the east. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
18	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 14 and 21. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
21	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre	Staff originally recommended this change, in conjunction with changes G, 4, 14 and 18. See the discussion under G and 4 above. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

As shown on Table ALT-3, all of the staff recommended changes proposed under this alternative would mitigate land use related impacts. However, each would also result in increased development intensities, which could result in increased impacts for issues related to population increases, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Increased densities, particularly in areas far from the core of the Town, would likely result in aesthetic impacts greater than expected under the proposed plan.

However, because development would likely be confined to areas already designated for development, impacts to biological and cultural resources would be largely similar to what is expected under the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts related to hazardous materials would also be similar to what would be expected under the proposed plan, as would impacts related to geology and hydrology.

5.4 ALTERNATIVE 4 (Maximum Development Scenario)

After the initial opportunities for citizen input, a preliminary version of the updated General Plan was developed, which formed the basis of the Proposed Project. Alternatives 2 and 3 consider other changes that were ultimately not incorporated into the proposed General Plan update.

Since that time, several other citizen requests have come forward that have not been previously considered. This alternative considers these requests. Specifically, this alternative considers a "maximum buildout" scenario, which is a combination of the changes suggested under the Proposed Project (Table LU-1), the original citizen requests and staff recommendations (Table ALT-2), and recently-suggested citizen requests not contained in Table ALT-2. These requests are listed and evaluated in Table ALT-4 below, showing their potential to address one or more environmental or land use impacts.

Table ALT-4. Alternative Recent Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
37	The Town recently purchased property to connect the two discontinuous portions of Holly Street. This is a request for this connector to not be built.	The purpose of the Holly Street connector is to provide for better traffic flow in this residential area. The concern is that traffic would increase along Holly Street, which could result in adverse impacts to neighboring homes. The magnitude of increase is not expected to be substantial, as it would not provide a "shortcut" route to I-80 from Taylor Road (it would still be more convenient to use Oak, Walnut, or Horseshoe bar Road). The connector does not currently exist. Its removal would not change the existing condition. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *The connector, if built, could improve local circulation, but have adverse land use impacts.*
38/47	Change the area at the southeast corner of I-80 and Sierra College Boulevard from Office to General Commercial.	This would provide a logical land use along the freeway, and would be generally consistent with adjacent commercial designations. However, it would add additional traffic to an interchange that will already experience heavy traffic volumes under the proposed General Plan. Commercial uses may cause land use conflicts with residential uses to the east, along Brace Road. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases traffic congestion at Sierra College/I-80 interchange; potential land use conflicts with adjacent residential uses.*
39/48	Requests setbacks between single-family dwellings and second units be increased to more than 25 feet. Would affect development Townwide	An increased setback between single family homes and second units could increase privacy for the primary residence. However, many properties are constrained by size, and this provision could remove the potential to exercise this future option, which could negatively affect property values. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Could adversely affect property rights of individuals by limiting development potential. No environmental impacts, per se*
40	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per acre at 6589 Brace Road (near Horseshoe Bar Road)	The purpose of this request is to increase development potential of a single property in an area surrounded by lower density uses. This change would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by Residential with a 4.6-acre minimum parcel size. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Constitutes spot zoning.*
41	Change a small property near I-80 from Residential Medium Density to Business Professional.	The purpose is to change a land use that would be difficult to maintain as residential, because of its proximity to the freeway. However, this change would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by residential uses. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Land Use; as it may be considered spot zoning*
42 (same as Area H)	Requests the site retain its current Planned development designation (APN 043-080-044)	This request would retain the current status, so it would have no impacts per se. However, an opportunity to provide an increased concentration of commercial uses in the downtown area would be missed **Issues Mitigated:** *None; possibly less traffic and fewer land use impacts than what is contemplated under the proposed General Plan* **Adverse Effects:** *None*
43	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 2.3 acres to 1 unit per acre, at two locations on King Road (APN 044-051-072 and –073)	Would be compatible with adjacent land uses, provided one intervening parcel would also be similarly redesignated. Does not address any potential impacts. **Issues Mitigated:** None **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*

Table ALT-4. Alternative Recent Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
44/4A	Requests site support increased residential density, from 4.6-acre minimum to 1-acre minimum	The purpose of this request is address undersized lots that cannot be developed under the proposed designation. The request would be consistent with adjacent land use designations. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
45/20	Requests a large area in southwestern Loomis support increased residential density, from 4.6-acre minimum to 1 unit per ½ to ¾ acre, generally west of Barton Road	This would constitute a major increase in residential density in a relatively rural portion of Loomis. Based on the request, an estimated additional 500 to 700 dwelling units could be accommodated by this request. This would cause a substantial increase in traffic (about 5,000 to 7,000 more daily trips), and would fundamentally change the rural character of southwestern Loomis. It is inconsistent with the core concept of concentrating the density of uses near the Town's downtown core. Development would also occur in areas not served by sewer infrastructure, with poor roadway access. Substantial biological impacts could occur, related to the removal of oak trees. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Substantial biological impacts could occur.*
46	The request is to close one end of Del Mar Avenue, with conflicting proposals on how to best accomplish this.	Citizens have petitioned to close one end of Del Mar Avenue, to increase public safety along the narrow roadway. It is currently used as a shortcut to avoid traffic on Sierra College Boulevard. The impact could reduce land use/safety impacts along the roadway, but cause increased congestion at the intersection of King Road and Sierra College Boulevard. **Issues Mitigated:** *Land Use (safety related to traffic)* **Adverse Effects:** *Traffic patterns would be altered, and access to Del mar Avenue could be adversely affected*
49	Increase development density of 4 lots of Medium Density Residential (2-6 du/ac) to R-2 zoning, near 3975 Noah Lane (APN 044-150-041)	This request does not include a land use designation change, but rather suggests a zone change that is potentially consistent with the land use designation. No adverse impacts are expected. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *None*
50	This request would close Bankhead Road to through traffic	The request is non-specific by what is meant by through traffic. However, it suggests substantially significant adverse traffic impacts, as Bankhead is expected to carry 9,800 ADT at future buildout. The restriction on through traffic would undoubtedly increase the burden on Sierra College Boulevard, which is anticipated to experience heavy congestion in the future. heavily con is a citizen request that Staff did not recommend this because it conflicts with the core concept. **Issues Mitigated:** *Local land use impacts along Bankhead Road* **Adverse Effects:** *Substantial traffic impacts on adjacent roads*
51	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 2.3 acres to 1 unit per acre	This request would substantially increase traffic along Bankhead Road and nearby roadways, including Sierra College Boulevard. Higher densities at this location are potentially inconsistent with the core concept, which strives to maintain lower densities as one moves away from the downtown area. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
52/45	Requests a change from 4.6 acre residential designation to one unit per 1.3 acres. The location is in the southwestern portion of	This is part of the larger request for higher densities in southwestern Loomis. Please refer to the discussion under request 45/20. The request is inconsistent with the core concept of concentrating the density of uses near the Town's downtown core.

Table ALT-4. Alternative Recent Citizen Requests

Map Identifier	Description of Change	Discussion
	Loomis, at 5828 and 5832 Shambaugh Lane. See the discussion under request 45/20.	**Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities*
53	Change the allowable residential density from 1 unit per 4.6 acres to 1 unit per 2.3 acres at 4353 Barton Road (APN 045-062-043 and –044)	The purpose of this request is to increase development potential in an area surrounded by lower density uses. This change would constitute spot zoning, as it is completely surrounded by Residential with a 4.6-acre minimum parcel size. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases residential potential, affecting issues related to population growth, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Constitutes spot zoning.*
13/19/33	Redesignate large area west of I-80/Sierra College Blvd. interchange for commercial uses from Residential Rural. Area closest to the north side of I-80 (areas 13 and 33) would be for office uses, while the area closest to Sierra College Blvd would be primarily commercial	This redesignation would substantially increase traffic in the area near the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard interchange. In addition, development of this type and intensity would be inconsistent with the core concept, and may be potentially incompatible with Residential (4.6 ac/du) to the west, near the southern portion of Del Mar Avenue. Substantial traffic and land use impacts could result. **Issues Mitigated:** *None* **Adverse Effects:** *Increases traffic congestion at Sierra College/I-80 interchange; potential land use conflicts with adjacent residential uses.*

As shown on Table ALT-4, most of the additional citizen requests would result in additional impacts, primarily related to land use or traffic. Many of the citizen requests are for higher density residential uses than are currently in place, which could result in increased impacts for issues related to population increases, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Increased densities, particularly in areas far from the core of the Town, would likely result in aesthetic impacts greater than expected under the proposed plan. Increased commercial development in some cases may further contribute to traffic impacts expected under the plan.

However, most changes contemplated would not result in impacts substantially increased to what would be expected under the proposed project. Certain requests are notable exceptions. The request for increased densities in the southwestern portion of Loomis (45/20 and 52/45) could have fundamental impacts to the rural character of Loomis, and could result in substantial land use, traffic and biological impacts. Increased commercial uses near I-80 (requests 38/47 and 13/19/33) would have substantial traffic and land use impacts near the Sierra College Boulevard/I-80 interchange.

As with the other alternatives, because development would likely be confined to areas already designated for development, impacts to biological and cultural resources would be largely similar to what is expected under the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts related to hazardous materials would also be similar to what would be expected under the proposed plan.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

This section evaluates the findings for proposed project and the four alternatives under consideration. It also identifies the environmentally superior alternative for each issue area, as

shown on Table ALT-5. If the No Project Alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative for a given issue area, the development scenario among the remaining alternatives that produces the fewest alternatives is noted, in accordance with CEQA. In addition, the table shows whether each alternative's environmental impact is greater, lesser, or similar to the proposed project.

No alternative is clearly superior to the proposed project, although certain alternatives have some superior aspects. Development under the existing plan (No Project, Alternative 1) would result in the least amount of future development, which makes it superior for issues related to the magnitude of population increase. Such issues include public services, utilities, and air quality. Although traffic and related noise generated under this alternative would be incrementally less, this scenario would not include many of the mitigating effects of the proposed plan. It would also result in greater land use impacts than under the proposed plan, which would specifically address many known land use conflicts in the community. Impacts related to the protection of natural resources would also be worse, because the existing plan does not include as stringent policy controls to address these issues.

Alternative 3 would include staff recommendations that would reduce land use conflicts to the maximum extent of any alternative. It is notably superior in that regard. It would also include the mitigate policies and programs included under the proposed General Plan Update. However, the slightly increased development intensity associated with some of the proposed land use changes (see Table ALT-2) would incrementally increase potential population-related impacts, including traffic, noise, air quality, public services and utilities. Issues related to the protection of natural resources, and safety/hazard issues, would be similar to what is expect4d under the proposed project. Overall, it is similarly superior to the proposed plan, and slightly preferable to the existing plan (Alternative 1).

Table ALT-5. Impact Comparison of Alternatives to Proposed Project

Issue	**Proposed Project**	**Alt. 1** *(No Project-Existing Plan)*	**Alt. 2** *(Staff and Citizen Requests)*	**Alt. 3** *(Staff Recommendations Only)*	**Alt. 4** *(Maximum Buildout Scenario)*
Aesthetics	=	-	-	-	-
Air Quality	=	+	-	-	-
Biology	=	-	=	=	-
Cultural Res.	=	-	=	=	=
Geology	=	+	-	=	=
Haz. Mat.	=	+	=	=	=
Hydrology	=	-	-	=	=
Land Use	=	-	+/-	+	-
Noise	=	-	-	-	-
Pub. Services	=	+	-	-	-
Transportation	=	-	-	-	-
Utilities	=	+	-	-	-
Overall	**=**	**+/-**	**-**	**+/-**	**-**

- *Greater impact than the proposed project*
+ *Less impact than the proposed project*
+/- *Characteristics both better and worse than the proposed project*
= *Similar impact to the proposed project*

.

Alternative 2 includes many citizen requests that could introduce impacts not anticipated under the proposed General Plan Update. It is therefore considered generally environmentally inferior to the proposed plan. Alternative 4 includes the maximum buildout scenario, which includes the positive aspects of the proposed project and Alternative 3, but introduces many citizen requests that have the effect of greatly increasing development potential. Impacts to traffic and aesthetics in particular would be substantially worse, as would land use conflicts in many areas.

Overall, the proposed project and alternative 3 are considered similarly superior, with development under the existing plan (Alternative 1) slightly environmentally worse. Alternative 4 carries by far the greatest environmental impacts.

6.0 REFERENCES and PREPARERS

6.1 REFERENCES

California Department of Fish and Game. *Special Plants List*. Natural Heritage Division, Natural Diversity Data Base. July 1999.

California Department of Fish and Game. *Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California*. 14 pgs. Natural Heritage Division, Plant Conservation Program. July 1997.

California Department of Fish and Game. *Endangered and Threatened Animals of California*. 11 pgs. Natural Heritage Division, Natural Diversity Data Base. January 1997.

California Department of Fish and Game. *Riparian and Wetland Habitats: Descriptions, Human Impacts, and Recommended Setbacks for Impact Management*. Draft report prepared by J. McCauley and J. Single, Environmental Services Division, Region 4. 1995.

California Department of Transportation. *1998 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways*. July 1999.

California EPA, Air Resources Board. *California Air Quality Data.* Annual summaries of air quality data for gaseous and particulate pollutants. 1996, 1997, 1998.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. Office of Biological Services, Fish and Wildlife Services, U.S. Department of the Interior.103 pgs. December 1979.

Holland, Robert F. *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*. California Department of Fish and Game, Nongame Heritage Program. 156 pgs. October 1986.

Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, D.C. *Trip Generation, 5th Edition*. Updated February 1995.

Loomis, Town of. *General Plan*. 1989

Loomis, Town of. General Plan Update Technical Background Report. 1998.

Loomis, Town of. *Heritage Park Estates FEIR*, 1998. Prepared by CSW Associates.

Loomis, Town of. *Sherwood Park Draft EIR*, 1998. Prepared by Harding Lawson Associates.

Loomis, Town of. *Loomis Town Center Master Plan EIR*, 1992. Prepared by CSW Associates.

Loomis, Town of. *Shadowbrook EIR*, 1997. Prepared by ESA.

Loomis, Town of. *Final EIR for K-8 Site,* 1994. Prepared by QUAD.

Loomis, Town of. *Turtle Island EIR*, 1996. Prepared by ESA.

Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences. *Interim Materials on Highway Capacity, Transportation Circular #212.* 1980.

Placer County. *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan*, 1993. Prepared by Jones and Stokes.

Placer County. *Granite Bay Community Plan*, 1994.

Planning Concepts. *Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Town of Loomis Specific Plan Area.* 1988. Prepared by Alfred Farber.

USEPA. *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations.* PB 206 717. December 31, 1971.

USEPA. *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors.* EPA AP-42. 1985.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *US Listed Flowering Plant Species Index by Lead Region and Status, as of January 31, 1997.* January 31, 1997.

6.2 PREPARERS

This EIR was prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. under subcontract to Crawford Multari Clark & Mohr. Persons involved in data gathering analysis, project management, and quality control include:

John Rickenbach, AICP, Project Manager
Duane Vander Pluym, D.Env., Principal
Joe Power, AICP, Senior Associate
Jennifer Kampbell, Associate
Walt Hamann, CEG, Principal
John Johnson, Graphic Designer