

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert King, Town Planner
Town of Loomis

FROM: Adrienne Graham, AICP

DATE: July 16, 2018

RE: Public and Agency Comments on the Flying Change Farms IS/MND

The Draft Initial Study (Draft IS)/Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Declaration for the Flying Change Farms project was circulated from June 1 to July 2, 2018. A total of 19 comment letters were received, including 8 letters from State or local agencies, 1 letter from an organization and 10 letters from individuals.

I have reviewed all of the comments, and, as discussed in more detail below, none suggest and/or provide evidence that the analysis in the Draft Initial Study is inadequate or inaccurate. However, there are several recommended revisions that are warranted:

1. Recognizing that the City of Rocklin would need to issue an encroachment permit for any work done on Rocklin Road within the City limits;
2. Modifying mitigation restricting open burning of vegetation on the project site; and
3. Adding an explicit requirement that when cultural resources are found that are of Native American origin, the appropriate Native American representative be consulted regarding the evaluation and treatment of the find.

These changes are reflected in the attached errata. None of the revisions alters the conclusions of the Draft IS that all of the proposed project's environmental impacts would be less than significant or reduced to a less-than-significant level through mitigation.

Public Agency and Organization Comments

The comments received from public agencies are summarized below, and responses to the substantive comments are provided as well.

City of Rocklin: The City of Rocklin did not comment on the adequacy of the Draft IS, but did provide a list of suggested Conditions of Approval (COA). As stated in the City's letter, the suggested COA came in large part from the Draft Initial Study. For example, the sizes and types of facilities to be constructed are listed on page 2-6, the number of horses to be boarded (maximum of 55) is provided on page 2-6, statements regarding not hosting horseshows or similar events, operating hours, fly control and manure management are addressed on pages 2-8. The Draft IS analyzes the environmental effects of the project as described in the project description. To further ensure that the project is implemented as described and as analyzed in the Draft IS, the Town will adopt COA that reflect the pertinent components of the project description. Including these

COA would reinforce the project description and would therefore not alter the analysis in the Draft IS.

Those items that could affect the environment are addressed within Chapter 3 of the Draft IS. For example, lighting is addressed on page 3-5. Manure management requirements and the fly system are further discussed on page 3-16. The City's suggested Conditions 11, 12 and 13 repeat the requirements of Mitigation Measure 2 (page 3-16), regarding minimum distances between manure storage and the property line, manure storage and disposal, and maintenance of the fly system. As required by CEQA, all mitigation measures will become Conditions of Approval.

There is one suggested COA, #15, that is not included in the project description or mitigation. It suggests the "Owner shall provide invoices of the licensed waste hauler noting removal of manure and soiled bedding from the Manure Garage." The Town will adopt a COA requiring that the property owner provide invoices from a licensed waste hauler noting removal of manure and soiled bedding from the manure garage.

The City also requested that the applicant be required to implement the suggestion of the Traffic Analysis (April 2018) that when the project-related improvements to the intersection of Rocklin Road and James Drive are made, that the tapers should be installed at their ultimate location on Rocklin Road, which is planned to be widened. The City further suggests that the work include confirmation of adequate site distance from the new access. These suggestions do not address the adequacy of the traffic analysis, and, if implemented, would not change the purpose, nature or size of the roadway improvements. Therefore, the conclusions of the Draft IS would not be affected whether or not the recommendations are implemented.

The City also requested that the list of actions by other agencies (page 2-13 of the Draft IS) include an encroachment permit from the City for improvements on Rocklin Road within the City limits. As stated above, and shown in the attached errata, this requested revision been made.

Finally, the City requested that BMPs be identified to specifically address manure-contaminated waste from being discharged to the pond or Secret Ravine. As discussed above, manure and soiled bedding from stalls will be contained, so it won't enter runoff. Turn-out paddocks would be located in the southern portion of the project site, and not about the creek or pond, so it is unlikely that there would be high concentrations of manure in runoff that reaches the pond or creek. Horses would not spend extended periods of time in the arenas, or be present in the arenas in large numbers, so there would not be a substantial contribution of manure from these areas. Furthermore, typically, manure is removed from arenas right away because it affects footing. For these reasons, it is not anticipated that runoff contaminated with manure or soiled bedding would substantially affect the pond or creek.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board: The CVRWQCB letter did not comment on the specifics of the Draft IS. Rather, the letter identified the various permitting requirements that apply to construction and operation of a variety of projects. The proposed project will comply with those regulations that are applicable. For example, as stated on page 3-48, the proposed project must obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit, and prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The proposed project must also comply with the Town's

grading ordinance and the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual, which was prepared to ensure compliance with Town's, and other West Placer jurisdictions', Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit. The other permits identified in the CVRWQCB letter would not apply to the proposed project.

Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD): The PCAPCD requested that two conditions be required of the project. The first condition would state that offsite odors and dust are subject to District Rule 228 Fugitive Dust and District Rule 205 Nuisance. The proposed project is already required to comply with these rules, similar to any other applicable regulation, so COA is not necessary. Similarly, the PCAPCD requested a COA that open burning would be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. As a commercial entity, the proposed project would be required to obtain a permit in order to conduct burning on site. Therefore no COA is required.

The PCAPCD also suggested a clarification to Mitigation Measure 1 regarding burning of vegetation during construction. The requested change has been incorporated into Mitigation Measure 1, as shown in the attached Errata.

Placer County Division of Environmental Health: The Division of Environmental Health comment letter requested that a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment be performed, and suggested a number of conditions of approval. As stated on page 3-43 of the Draft IS, an Environmental Research Report (ERA) was prepared for the project site in April 2005. That report is being forwarded to the County for their information. The ERA found that the only potential source of hazardous materials was a waste-oil storage tank, which was removed in the mid-1980s. There have been no material changes on the project site since 2005, so the provided adequate documentation to analyze the potential impacts related to hazardous materials.

Of the COA recommended in the comment letter, several have already been completed (#2, 3, 4, 8), or do not apply to the proposed project (#5). Of the outstanding suggested COA, #6 and #10 address existing wells, which will not be altered by the proposed project; #7 addresses solid waste disposal, which is addressed through the project description and existing mitigation and COA; and #9 addresses the leachfield system, which will be addressed as part of the permit for the new septic system. Further, the proposed project will comply with all applicable County regulations. Therefore, no changes to the COA proposed by the Town and/or the mitigation in the Draft IS need to be revised in order to ensure that these issues are adequately addressed.

South Placer Municipal Utility District: SPMUD provided a summary of requirements the project would need to comply with if it planned to connect to the SPMUD sewer system. The proposed project will rely on a septic system for wastewater disposal, so there will be no connection to the SPMUD system.

Other Agency Comments: The Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District stated that they reviewed the IS/MND and have no specific comments. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research commented that the Town complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements, pursuant to CEQA. No response to these comments is required.

United Auburn Indian Community: The UAIC requested that mitigation be included to address the inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources. Mitigation Measure 6(a) of the

Draft IS includes provisions similar to those recommended by the UAIC. For example, if any cultural resources are found during construction, all work will be suspended within 100 feet of the find, which will be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist (page 3-32). The measure also requires consultation with tribal representatives, where applicable, in preparation of reports for resources found to be potentially eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. As shown in the attached errata, Mitigation Measure 6(a) has been revised to clarify that if a find is of Native American origin, then the appropriate Native American representative must be consulted regarding evaluation and treatment of the find, and that the outcome of the consultation must be documented. With this change, the Draft IS mitigation measure is generally consistent with the mitigation requested by the UAIC.

Public Comments

ten comment letters were received from the public. In each case, these comments expressed support for the proposed project, and did not address the adequacy of the Draft IS. Therefore, no response to these comments is provided.