
**ADDENDUM TO
AMORUSO RANCH PROJECT SPECIFIC PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(SCH # 2013102057, CERTIFIED ON JUNE 15, 2016)**

- Project Title/File Number:** Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) / 2011PL-039 (ANN-000007, GPA-000061, SPA-000043, RZ-000058 & DA-000047)
- Project Location:** Accessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 017-020-03, 017-020-036, 017-020-037, 017-010-010, 017-010-011; United States Geological Survey, "Pleasant Grove, CA" 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle, Township 11 North Range 5 East, Sections 11 and 14, Mt. Diablo Baseline and Meridian.
- Project Description**
- The Project as originally proposed and analyzed in the previously certified EIR includes the following components:
- Adoption of the ARSP, which establishes the land use and regulatory framework for approximately 695 acres of mixed-use development (residential, commercial, public/quasi-public, and open space);
 - Approval of amendments to the City of Roseville (City) General Plan;
 - Approval of pre-zoning designations;
 - Approval of a large lot tentative subdivision map;
 - Approval of development agreements between the City and the Applicant and landowners;
 - Amendment of the City's sphere of influence to include the Project site; and
 - Annexation of the project site into the City.
- Proposed modifications to the Project and previously adopted EIR include the following:
- Adoption of amended ARSP;
 - Approval of amended zoning designations;
 - Approval of amended large lot tentative subdivision map;
 - Approval of amended development agreement between the City and Applicant
 - Adoption of Amended Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (to Eliminate Mitigation Measure 4.12.1-1)
- See below for more detail.
- Project Applicant:** Brookfield Residential / Amoruso Family Trust
- Property Owner:**
- Angela Eisenpress, Successor Trustee of the Amoruso Family Living Trust, Dated March 14, 2005

- Brookfield Sacramento Holdings, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company

Lead Agency Contact: Gina McColl, Associate Planner

An Addendum to a previously certified and adopted environmental impact report (EIR) may be prepared for a project if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred (California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines [CEQA] Section 15164). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, the below analysis has been prepared in order to demonstrate that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred and that only minor technical changes or additions are necessary in order to deem the certified EIR adequate to describe the impacts of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 also states that an addendum need not be circulated for public review, but can be included in or attached to the certified EIR for consideration by the hearing body. This Addendum focuses only on those aspects of the project or its impacts that require additional discussion.

Table of Contents

Project Description	4
Purpose and Scope of Addendum	7
Environmental Checklist for Addendum Environmental Review	10
Environmental Determination	24
Attachments	24

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

For a detailed description of the project location, refer to Chapter 2 of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) and Chapter 2 of the environmental impact report (EIR), included here as Attachment 1. The project site is located along the northern edge of the City of Roseville, approximately 6.5 miles west of Interstate 80 and State Route 65 and 5 miles northwest of downtown Roseville on approximately 695 acres. The Project site consists of APNs 017-020-016-510, 017-020-017-510, 017-010-054-000, 017-010-010-000 and is found on the United States Geological Survey in the “Pleasant Grove, CA” 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle, Township 11 North Range 5 East, Sections 11 and 14, Mt. Diablo Baseline and Meridian. See Figure 2-1 of the EIR and Figure 2.2 of the ARSP.

Background

For detailed Project background information, refer to Section 2.2 of the EIR. The ARSP was developed to comport with the City’s growth vision and create a “comprehensively planned, residential-based community with a mix of land uses” to provide “employment opportunities” and “housing choices” to help the City meet “its obligation to accommodate...future population growth in the region” (Final EIR [FEIR], p. 2-9). In May 2011, a formal project application was submitted to the City, and in 2013 the notice of preparation (NOP) was released. The EIR was prepared to analyze potential environment effects associated with adoption of the ARSP and affiliated Project components and entitlements. The Draft EIR (DEIR) was distributed for public review on March 1, 2016. Several public workshops and hearings were held from March 10 to April 11, 2016, after which the FEIR was prepared. On April 14, 2016, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt and approve all Project components and affiliated entitlements of the ARSP and certify the EIR, and on June 15, 2016, the City Council did so (Resolution No. 16-271).

Thereafter, the Applicant began coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for a federal Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit as required for development of land featuring jurisdictional wetlands (FEIR, p. 2-63). During this process, the USACE required additional avoidance of wetland features above what was initially proposed and analyzed in the EIR. To meet this requirement and effectuate other minor Project changes, the ARSP has been amended, which in turn causes amendments to zoning designations, the large lot tentative subdivision map, and the development agreement between the City and Applicant, which are discussed in more detail below and analyzed throughout this addendum.

Environmental Setting

For a detailed description of the environmental setting of the project site and its surrounds, refer to the “Environmental Setting” subsections within Sections 4.1 through 4.15 in Chapter 4 of the EIR; see also Section 2.3 and Figure 2-6 of the EIR. The project site’s land uses have been re-designated and rezoned as detailed in Chapter 4 of the ARSP and Chapter 2 of the EIR (and discussed below) and currently remains undeveloped. Prior land use designations for the project site and existing land use designations of its surrounds can be found in Sections 2.3 and 4.1.2 of the EIR (see FEIR, Figure 4.1-2). Generally, the site is characterized by gently rolling terrain and contains nonnative annual grasslands, some wetlands, and University Creek, which runs east to west through the southwest portion of the site (FEIR, pp. 2-4 to 2-6). Land to the north, east, and west of the northern portion of the site is in unincorporated Placer County and is comprised of rural subdivision with multi-acre parcels and agricultural land (FEIR, p. 4.1-2). Land to the south, southwest, and west of the southern portion of the project site is in the City, a portion of which to the southeast will remain open space as the planned Al Johnson Wildlife Area; another portion of which to the south is slated to be developed as a 501-acre residential development (Id., p. 4.1-4).

Proposed Project

Originally Proposed Project

For a detailed description of the originally proposed Project, refer to Chapter 4 of the ARSP and Chapter 2 of the EIR. A brief summary is included below.

Primary components of the originally proposed Project include:

- Adoption of the ARSP: The ASRP established the land use and regulatory framework for an approximate 695-acre mixed-use development that included 2,827 residential units (1,302 low density, 542 medium density, and 873 high density); 51 acres of commercial; 17 acres of public and quasi-public; 22 acres of parks; 145 acres of open space; and 20 acres for urban reserve uses. Development would occur over 30 years and three phases (FEIR, p. 2-58). The City Council adopted the ARSP and EIR on June 15, 2016.
- Approval of Amendments to the City General Plan: The project site was designated Agricultural/80-acre minimum in the Placer County General Plan (1994) and, as part of the Project, was annexed into the City and re-designated as indicated in Table 2-1 of the FEIR for future development as prescribed in Chapter 4 of the ARSP and Chapter 2 of the EIR. The General Plan amendments were approved by City Council on June 15, 2016.
- Approval of Pre-zoning Designations: The project site was zoned Building Site, 80 acres minimum (F-B-X 80 acre) by Placer County and, as part of the Project, was annexed into the City and rezoned as indicated in Table 2-1 of the FEIR for future development as prescribed in Chapter 4 of the ARSP and Chapter 2 of the EIR. The zoning designations were approved by City Council on June 15, 2016.
- Approval of Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map: The large lot tentative subdivision map was approved by City Council on January 10, 2019; large lot final map recorded May 3, 2019, in Book EE of Maps, at Page 51, Official Records of Placer County.
- Approval of Development Agreements between City and the Applicant and Landowners: The development agreements are binding contracts through which the ARSP would be implemented. They were approved by City Council on June 15, 2016.
- Amendment of the City's Sphere of Influence: The City's sphere of influence would be amended to include the project site. The sphere of influence was approved for amendment by City Council on June 15, 2016.
- Annexation of Project site into City: The project site would be annexed into the City from the County upon approval by Placer County LAFCO. A request to LAFCO for annexation was approved by City Council on June 15, 2016. LAFCO approved annexation on December 18, 2018.

Proposed Project Modifications

Modifications to the proposed Project are described below and analyzed for their potential environmental effects throughout this addendum.

- Adoption of Amended ARSP: The ARSP will be amended to include additional avoidance of wetland features and implement other minor Project changes. Amendments listed below are discussed in revised Sections 4.1 through 4.3 of the ARSP Amendment, included here as Attachment 2, and reflected in revised Figure 4.1 and Tables 4.1 and 4.2. The Amended ARSP will require adoption by City Council.

-
- Increase of approximately 10-acres of land designated as Open Space and zoned Open Space (OS) in parcels AR-97 and AR-105 along the southern border of the project site, to accommodate USACE’s requirement for additional wetland avoidance in order to obtain a CWA Section 404 permit;
 - To accommodate this increase in open space, the following would occur:
 - A reduction of approximately 10-acres of land designated as Low Density Residential and zoned Small Lot Residential (RS) in parcels AR-24 and AR-37, which abut the increased open space area at the southern border of the project site
 - A corresponding transfer of 50 Low Density Residential (LDR) units from these parcels to 50 Community Commercial – Village Center (CC-VC) residential units to be located within the inner core of the project site on AR-52;
 - Assorted smaller acreage transfers from parcels designated and zoned for residential to those designated and zoned for open space to accommodate an increase in buffers between developed and undeveloped portions of the Project;
 - Amended zoning designation for parcels AR-1, AR-2, and AR-3 from Single-Family Residential (R1) to Small Lot Residential (RS), to accommodate changing demographics and market trends;
 - Division of parcel AR-55 into three separate parcels (AR-55, AR-58, and AR-59) to better match comparable specific plans within the City’s sphere of influence that have created separate parcels for separate Public/Quasi Public land uses (ARSP Amendment, pp. 9-2, B-17), with AR-58 remaining reserved for water facilities (included the potential well site), AR-59 remaining reserved for recycled water and wastewater, and AR-55 remaining reserved for other undetermined community purposes. All three parcels will be dedicated to the City in fee.
 - Removal of the planned 60 kilovolt (kV) electrical line along Westbrook Boulevard and Road A, to accommodate changes with the neighboring planned development Placer Ranch that will remain under Placer County jurisdiction instead of being annexed in to the City as previously planned (ARSP Amendment, pp. 9-13 to 9-14; see FEIR, p. 4.12-5-3); and
 - Additional restrictions on fencing and housing placement along open space boundaries that require fencing to remain visually open no more than 50 percent of open space to have homes backing onto it (see ARSP Amendment, Appendix A, pp. A-4 to A-5).
 - Minor changes to the water transmission and drainage systems in the southeastern portion of the project site to accommodate the above-described changes (see ARSP Amendment, pp. 9-4, 9-10; see also Utility Systems Updates Technical Memorandum, included here as Attachment 3).
- Approval of Amended Zoning Designations: The amended zoning designations described above will require City Council approval.
 - Approval of Amended Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map: The large lot tentative map has been amended to reflect the ARSP amendments described above and will require Planning Commission approval.
 - Approval of Amended Development Agreement between City and Applicant: Amendments to the development agreement between the City and Applicant have been made to reflect the ARSP amendments described above and will require City Council approval. The amended development agreement is included here as Attachment 4.

- Re-adoption of Amended Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (to Eliminate Mitigation Measure 4.12.1-1): Mitigation Measures (MM) 4.12.1-2 will be eliminated because it has been determined that the City is responsible for securing and ensuring a water supply to the project site—not the Applicant (FEIR, p. 4.12.1-67). In lieu, the Applicant shall pay the City water connection fees. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) adopted on June 15, 2016 (see Resolution No. 16-271) will be amended to exclude this measure and requires re-adoption by City Council.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

Basis for Addendum

This addendum has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and legislative directives (CEQA Guidelines § 15164; Public Resources Code [PRC] §§ 21083, 21166). An addendum is an appropriate subsequent document to a previously certified EIR when some changes to a project are necessary, but those changes do not create new or increased significant environmental impacts that warrant major revisions to the previous document (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162(a), 15164(a); see *Save Our Heritage Organisation v. City of San Diego* (2018) 28 Cal.App.5th 656, 668). Also, an addendum is appropriate when circumstances surrounding a project have not substantially changed and when no new information of substantial importance has been uncovered that indicates the project would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of the previously identified significant impacts (Ibid). Substantial evidence presented in this addendum demonstrates that the proposed Project modifications, described above and analyzed below, do not create any new significant impacts or increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts, nor are there any new circumstances or new information that would create such impacts or require more robust analysis (CEQA Guidelines § 15162(a)). Therefore, an addendum is the appropriate CEQA document, and a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not warranted (Id., § 15164(e)).

2018 CEQA Checklist Update

Since certification of the previous EIR, the Appendix G Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines has been updated, effective early 2019. Although not required, the updated checklist is included in this Addendum along with the prior version, as applicable as part of a good-faith effort to provide the most up-to-date information to decision makers and the public. (PRC §§ 21002.1(e), 210065; see CEQA Guidelines §§ 15002(a)(1), 15003(c).) The updated checklist is presented in strike out/underline to clearly show changes, which are discussed in the analysis where appropriate. This revised checklist material is not considered “new information” as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3). (See *Citizens Against Airport Pollution v. City of San Jose* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 788, 808; *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 413, 426.)

Impact Conclusions in Previous EIR

The EIR to which this addendum is being attached was certified by the City Council on June 15, 2016. It is currently available for review at the City of Roseville, Development Service Department, Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA, 95678, and online at <https://www.roseville.ca.us> under Government/Departments & Divisions/Planning/Specific Plans, Planning Areas & Development Agreements/Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan. See Background section above for more details.

The EIR identified the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- 4.1-3: Potential Incompatibility with Existing Agricultural and Other Land Uses in Placer County and the City of Roseville

- 4.1-8: Cumulative Impacts From Agricultural Resources Conversion
- 4.3-5: Increased Traffic Volumes at Intersections within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Under Existing Conditions
- 4.3-6: Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways Within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin Under Existing Conditions
- 4.3-8: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways Under Existing Conditions
- 4.3-9: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections Under 2035 CIP Conditions
- 4.3-11: Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, City of Rocklin, or City of Lincoln Intersections Under 2035 CIP Conditions
- 4.3-12: Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin Under 2035 CIP Conditions
- 4.4-1: Generate Short-Term Construction Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants
- 4.4-2: Generate Long-Term Operational Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants
- 4.4-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors
- 4.4-6: Consistency with Plans and Policies
- 4.5-1: Generate a Substantial Contribution To GHG Emissions that Conflicts with an Applicable Plan or Policy
- 4.6-1: Short-Term Noise Generated by Construction Activity
- 4.6-5: Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the Existing Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise
- 4.6-7: Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 CIP Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site
- 4.12.3-3: Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities
- 4.13-6: Construction of Off-Site Stormwater Retention Facilities
- 4.14-1: Alteration of the Visual Character of the Site and Vicinity
- 4.14-2: New Sources of Light and Glare
- 4.14-3: Degradation of Scenic Resources and Scenic Vistas

The EIR also identified the following cumulative impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- 4.3-15: Increased Traffic on City of Roseville Intersections Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions
- 4.3-17: Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions
- 4.3-20: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions
- 4.4-7: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants
- 4.6-9: Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site
- 4.8-18: Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources
- 4.12.1-4: Capacity of Water Treatment System to Meet Potable Water Demand
- 4.12.1-8: Cumulative Water Supply and Water Treatment Impacts
- 4.12.3-5: Cumulative Wastewater Impacts
- 4.12.4-5: Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts
- 4.14-4: Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts

No new impacts, including significant or unavoidable ones, occur as a result of proposed Project modifications, and none of the previously identified impacts are made substantially more severe (discussed in more detail below).

Issue Areas Removed from Additional Evaluation

Proposed Project modifications would not require additional construction or development on undeveloped land beyond what was previously analyzed in the certified EIR because there would be no increase in residential units and no other planned development where it was previously unplanned (see EIR, Figure 2-3, Section 2.11, and Section 4, compared with to ARSP Amendment, Figure 4.1). In fact, the increase in open space and decrease in development of undeveloped acreage from the original ARSP would slightly reduce environmental impacts overall. As a result, proposed Project modifications do not have the potential to change the regulatory framework, impact discussion, mitigation measures, or significance conclusions for the following issue areas: aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. These areas are not analyzed further in the checklist but are discussed briefly below. CEQA only requires that environmental documents give decisionmakers sufficient detail on environmental consequences and does not purport to merely “generate paper” by excessively explaining consequences that are “so simple they are almost self-explanatory.” (*Save Our Residential Environment v. City of West Hollywood* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 1745, 1754; *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 393; *Save Our Residential Environment v. City of West Hollywood* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 1745, 1754).

Revisions made to the ARSP would not change the overall aesthetic nature of the planned development, and some serve to reduce visual impacts—specifically the new open fencing and home placement restrictions that allow more open space to be viewed by visual receptors. Therefore, aesthetics need not be further analyzed. Similarly, agriculture and forestry resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, recreation, and tribal cultural resources do not require additional analysis. These issue areas require disturbance of previously undisturbed land to incur environmental effects, and the proposed Project modifications will not disturb more undisturbed land than previously analyzed in the certified EIR because it does not include new construction or development. Further, no increase in “construction and/or operation” means no additional or more severe impacts to, or from, energy, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing, public services, and recreation because there can be no physical environmental change to these issue areas without the impetus of such project action (FEIR, p. 1-9; see CEQA Guidelines §§ 15358(b), 15378(a)). And, changes to the water transmission and drainage systems that will occur in the southeastern portion of the project site are so minor that the systems remain “largely unchanged,” with water and drainage flows remaining “the same,” thereby precluding environmental impacts to issue areas as a result (see Utility Systems Updates Technical Memorandum, pp. 5, 10).

Impacts to transportation systems also would not increase because proposed Project modifications would not generate any significant amount of new vehicle trips beyond what was previously analyzed in the certified EIR (FEIR, pp. 4.3-43 to 4.3-44). Trip generation rates are based on development of structures and their respective land uses (e.g., high-density residential, low-density residential, commercial) (FEIR, Appendix M [p. 64]). No additional development will occur under proposed Project modifications, and the only relevant land-use shift will be a rezone that allows 50 residential units to change from a lower density housing designation (LDR) to higher density housing designation (CC-VC). This rezone will result in a slight decrease in the amount of daily trip numbers shown in the FEIR and will not exceed the City’s threshold for requiring additional analysis, which is set at an increase of 50 PM peak-hour trips (see FEIR, Table 4.3-7 [currently showing 609 PM peak-hour trips for multi-family residential units, significantly less than the 1,954 PM peak-hour trips for single-family residential]). Further, projected area distribution of vehicle trips will not change because the Project was analyzed with one external point of entry/egress only, which does not change with proposed modifications (see FEIR, Figure 4.3-5). No significant increase in vehicle trips, construction, or development means no increase in air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions because these are only relevant sources of project-related air pollutants (FEIR, p. 4.4-22 to 4.4-26, 4.5-20). Therefore, no additional environmental impacts to air quality and from greenhouse gas emissions would occur that could warrant further checklist evaluation. Lastly, wildfire need not be further addressed because the project site is not within a State Responsibility Area, which is a checklist threshold for

wildfire analysis; upon annexation it received fire protection from the Roseville Fire Department and not CAL FIRE (FEIR, pp. 4.11-5, 4.11-8).

A full discussion of how these issue areas may be impacted by the Project can be found in Chapter 4 of the EIR. See also “No New Circumstances or New Information” below.

Issue Areas Receiving Additional Evaluation

Some proposed ARSP amendments and EIR revisions, however, are so closely tied to certain issue areas that, although no impacts are anticipated, were evaluated out of an abundance of caution, specifically: biological resources, land use and planning, and utilities (water supply). See also “No New Circumstances or New Information” below.

No New Circumstances or New Information

Since certification of the previous EIR on June 15, 2016, circumstances surrounding the formerly proposed project and its location have not substantially changed nor has any new information of substantial importance come to light that indicates the Project would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of existing significant impacts (CEQA Guidelines § 15162(a)). No new projects beyond those discussed in the previously certified EIR have been approved or proposed within the vicinity of the project site that could impact or increase the Project’s environmental effects, and the City is not aware of any other new information that might bear relevance on the Project’s CEQA analysis. Nor is there new information of substantial importance showing that: (i) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be infeasible would actually now be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (ii) mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the previously certified CEQA documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects, but the proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. Therefore, there is no evidence on the record, or otherwise reasonably discoverable, indicating that any new circumstances or new information exist that that would: (a) create new significant impacts; (b) substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts; (c) or require additional analysis or verification. As a result, all boxes in the “New Circumstances” and “New Information” columns in the checklist below are marked “No.” Note that USACE’s requirement for additional wetland avoidance, discussed above in the “Background” section and below in Biological Resources,” is a not a result of newly discovered wetlands or inadequate EIR analysis or mitigation measures but a product of unanticipated requirements by the agency.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ADDENDUM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e. changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed in prior environmental documents.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Where Impact was Analyzed

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the prior environmental documents where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project will result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered

and mitigated by the prior environmental review documents and related approvals, or will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) which have occurred subsequent to the certification or adoption of prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A–D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified or adopted is available requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. Either “yes” or “no” will be answered to indicate whether there is new information showing that: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. If “no,” then no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required.

Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the prior environmental documents provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in any instance where mitigation was included, regardless of whether the mitigation has been completed at this time. If “none” is indicated, this environmental analysis concludes a significant impact does not occur with this project, no mitigation was previously included, and no mitigation is needed.

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

Discussion

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category in order to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue and the status of any mitigation that may be required or has already been implemented.

The discussion below relies on analysis conducted for the EIR with minor supplements were appropriate.

Mitigation Measures

Applicable mitigation measures from the prior environmental review that apply to the project are listed under each environmental category.

Conclusions

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the analysis contained in each section.

CHECKLIST

Biological Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Impact 4.8-3 Impact 4.8-4 Impact 4.8-5 Impact 4.8-6 Impact 4.8-11 Impact 4.8-12 Impact 4.8-14 (General loss of biological resources, onsite and offsite; cumulative impacts: Impact 4.8-15, Impact 4.8-16, Impact 4.8-18)	No	No	No	MM 4.8-3 MM 4.8-4 MM 4.8-5 MM 4.8-6 MM 4.8-7 MM 4.8-9 MM 4.8-10 (MM 4.8-1 (a) , MM 4.8-1 (b), MM 4.8-2, MM 4.8-3, MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-5, MM 4.8-6, MM 4.8-7, MM 4.8-9, MM 4.8-10, MM 4.8-11, MM 4.8-12)
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Impact 4.8-7 Impact 4.8-10 Impact 4.8-13	No	No	No	MM 4.8-7 MM 4.8-8 MM 4.14-3
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Impact 4.8-2	No	No	No	MM 4.8-1 (a) MM 4.8-1 (b) MM 4.8-2
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife	Impact 4.8-8	No	No	No	MM 4.8-8 MM 4.14-3

species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Impact 4.8-9	No	No	No	None
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Impact 4.8-14	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on <u>state or</u> federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	See item c above				
<p>Discussion: Biological resources are discussed in Section 4.8 of EIR. Impacts to biological resources as a result of Project implementation are discussed in Section 4.8.4 of the EIR, and mitigation measures to reduce these impacts are included in Section 4.8.5. The EIR addressed 18 impacts to biological resources, most of which were determined to be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. However, the EIR concluded that the Project would contribute to a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact to regional biological resources in conjunction with other regional development.</p> <p>Relevant proposed Project modifications include an amendment to the ARSP to add 10 acres of open space by expanding parcels that are already approved and designated/zoned for open space and reducing parcels already approved and designated/zoned for residential development and, to a lesser degree, assorted other smaller acreage transfers from land designated/zoned residential to open space (see “Project Description” above). The purpose of this 10-acre increase in open space is for additional avoidance of federally protected wetlands that occur on the project site, at the behest of the USACE—the federal permitting agency with jurisdiction over the required Section 404 permit (FEIR, p. 4.8-36). As part of the Section 404 permitting process, the USACE requested that the Applicant develop an alternative that would result in reduced adverse impacts to the aquatic environment, specifically to wetland resources within the southern portion of the Project site. This request for additional wetland avoidance was not known or anticipated at the time the original ARSP and EIR were prepared and adopted/certified. The Applicant and City have undertaken extensive consultation with the USACE during Project and document planning and preparation between June 2011 and November 2013, which resulted in the wetland protection and mitigation outlined in the EIR (see FEIR, p. 4.8-35). However, after preparation and release of the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) as required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for issuance of a Section 404 permit for the Project (USACE Action ID: SPK-2004-00888), the Applicant and the USACE continued to examine potential ways that the Project could be further modified to avoid wetlands, particularly in the southern portion of the Project site. As a result, the</p>					

proposed Project modifications include a revised land use plan that enlarges the southwestern open space area and reduces wetland impacts.

Parcels affected by this 10-acre transfer and other smaller acreage transfers are located on or near the southern/southwestern border of the project site and were found to contain terrestrial habitat (annual grassland) and aquatic habitat (vernal pools, seasonal wetland, seasonal wetland swale, intermittent drainage, seasonal creek/stream) along with vernal pool fairy shrimp, a federally protected special-status specie (see ARSP Amendment, Figure 4.1; FEIR, Figures 4.8-1 and 4.8-2, pp. 4.8-3 to 4.8-9 and 4.8-25 to 4.8-26). However, none of these, or any other, biological resources will be impacted by proposed Project modifications because no new or increased construction or development would occur that could impact habitat and species. In fact, the increase in open space will provide additional protection for habitat and species, specifically wetlands and fairy shrimp, essentially decreasing impacts and creating a beneficial effect that comports with, and does not conflict with, local policies/ordinances or conservation plans designed to protect species. Therefore, no substantially new or more severe significant impacts to biological resources as a result of proposed Project modifications will occur.

Mitigation Measures: Proposed Project modifications will not increase the potential for new significant or more severe significant impacts to biological resources, therefore no previous mitigation measures apply, and no new mitigation is warranted.

Conclusion: Proposed Project modifications will not create any significant new or substantially more severe significant impacts to biological resources; no mitigation is required.

Land Use and Planning

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact (FEIR, p. 4.1-31)	No	No	No	None
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Impact 4.1-1 Impact 4.1-2 Impact 4.1-3 Impact 4.1-4	No	No	No	MM 4.6-1a-d MM 4.6-2 MM 4.4-1
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Impact 4.8-14	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
b) Conflict Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Impact 4.1-1 Impact 4.1-2 Impact 4.1-3 Impact 4.1-4	No	No	No	MM 4.6-1a-d MM 4.6-2 MM 4.4-1
e) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Question deleted; see updated Land Use item b and Biological Resources item f				
<p>Discussion: Land use and planning is discussed in Section 4.1 of EIR. Impacts to land use and planning as a result of Project implementation are discussed in Section 4.1.4 of the EIR. The EIR addressed four impacts to land use and planning, three of which were less than significant level with mitigation. However, the EIR concluded that the Project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impact of incompatibility with existing land uses.</p> <p>Relevant proposed Project modifications include a 10-acre increase in land designated as Open Space and zoned Open Space (OS) and a commensurate 10-acre decrease in land designated as Low Density Residential and zoned Small Lot Residential (RS), along with assorted smaller acreage transfers from land designated/zoned residential to open space (see "Project Description" above). As a result of this acreage</p>					

shift, 50 proposed residential units would be transferred from parcels AR-24 and AR-37 to parcel AR-52 as higher density residential units (within the inner core of the project site). Additionally, amendments to zoning designations are proposed for parcels AR-1, AR-2, and AR-3 to rezone them from Single-Family Residential (R1) to Small Lot Residential (RS), to accommodate changing demographics and market trends. Further, a division of parcel AR-55 is proposed to create three separate parcels (AR-55, AR-58, and AR-59) in order to better match comparable specific plans within the City's sphere of influence that have created separate parcels for separate Public/Quasi Public land uses. After division, AR-58 will be reserved for water facilities, included a potential well site, AR-59 will be reserved for recycled water and wastewater facilities, and AR-55 will be reserved for other undetermined community purposes—all of these facilities were previously analyzed in the EIR (FEIR, pp. 2-12, 2-18, 4.12.1-36 to 4.12.1-67, 4.12.2-5 to 4.12.5-10). All three parcels will be dedicated to the City in fee.

These proposed amendments to zoning and land use do not change the overall nature of the Project and proposed development nor do they introduce any land uses that dramatically differ from those already analyzed in the previously certified EIR and approved by the City. These amendments would not physically divide an established community because, as stated in the EIR, “no community would be divided by the Proposed Project, as the project site is comprised of vacant land” (FEIR, p. 4.1-31). Further, like the originally proposed Project, the proposed amendments to land use and zoning would not conflict with (i.e., would be “consistent with”) applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, including: the City Blueprint Implementation Strategies, the City General Plan (Community Design Goals, Community Form, Growth Management), some City Zoning Ordinances (allowed uses), CALTRANS Airport Land use Handbook, and the McClellan Land Use Compatibility Plan (FEIR, pp. 4.1-31, 4.1-34, 4.1-37, 4.1-39, 4.1-43). Because there would be no conflict, there would be no significant environmental effect as a result of a conflict. Likewise with internal land uses within the proposed development and as outlined in the specific plan, the proposed changes would not conflict with the following applicable guidelines, and not cause a significant environmental effect as a result: the City Community Design Guidelines, City General Plan (Community Design Goals and Policies, Community Forum Goals and Policies) and City Zoning Ordinance (allowed uses), with implementation of mitigation for noise and construction emission reductions (FEIR, pp. 4.1-35 to 4.1-38).

Also, similar to the originally proposed Project, the proposed amendments have the potential to conflict with the City General Plan (Community Form-Relationship of New Development) and the Placer County General Plan (agricultural policies) in a way that causes a significant and unavoidable impact (FEIR, pp. 4.1-39 to 4.1-43). Any conflicts with the City Zoning Ordinance discussed in the EIR under Impact 4.1-3 are not applicable here as the project site as already been zoned for development as prescribed in the original ARSP (see Resolution No. 16-271) (FEIR, pp. 4.1-42 to 4.1-43). There are no mitigation measures presented or available to reduce this impact. However, this impact would not be made substantially more severe by the proposed amendments because, as stated above, the proposed amendments do not change the overall nature of the Project and proposed development nor do they introduce any land uses that dramatically differ from those already analyzed. Further, there are no conflicts with applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans; see “Biological Resources” above. Therefore, no substantially new or more severe significant impacts to land use and planning as a result of proposed Project modifications will occur.

Mitigation Measures: To lessen Impact 4.1-2, the following mitigation measure prescribed in the EIR are applicable to proposed Project modifications: MM 4.6-1a–d, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.4-1.

Conclusion: With implementation of applicable mitigation measures identified in the previously certified EIR and listed above, proposed Project modifications will not create any significant new or substantially more severe significant impacts to land use and planning.

Utilities and Service Systems

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Not Applicable				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Not Applicable				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Not Applicable				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Impact 4.12.1-1 Impact 4.12.1-2 Impact 4.12.1-3 Impact 4.12.1-4 Impact 4.12.1-5 Impact 4.12.1-6 Impact 4.12.1-7 Impact 4.12.1-8	No	No	No	MM 4.12.1-1

<p>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?</p>	Not Applicable				
<p>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</p>	Not Applicable				
<p>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	Not Applicable				
<p>2018 CEQA Checklist Update:</p>					
<p>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p>	Question deleted; see Utilities and Service Systems question c.				
<p>a b) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or stormwater, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	Not Applicable				
<p>e) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	Question deleted; see updated Utilities and Service Systems question a.				
<p>b d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p>	<p>Impact 4.12.1-1 Impact 4.12.1-2 Impact 4.12.1-3 Impact 4.12.1-4 Impact 4.12.1-5 Impact 4.12.1-6 Impact 4.12.1-7 Impact 4.12.1-8</p>	No	No	No	MM 4.12.1-1

<p>c e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>d f) <u>Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</u></p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>e g) Comply with federal, state, and local <u>management and reduction</u> statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>

Discussion: Proposed Utilities and service systems are discussed in Section 4.12 of the EIR. Impacts to utilities and services systems as a result of Project implementation are discussed in Sections 4.12.1.4, 4.12.2.4, 4.12.3.4, 4.12.4.4, and 4.12.5.4 of the EIR, and mitigation measures to reduce these impacts are included in Sections 4.12.1.5, 4.12.2.5, 4.12.3.5, 4.12.4.5, and 4.12.5.5. The EIR addressed 25 impacts to utilities and services systems, most of which will be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. However, the EIR concluded that the Project would contribute to five significant and unavoidable impacts to utilities and services systems, one of which occurs only in the cumulative scenario.

The proposed Project modifications have limited interplay with utilities and services systems, which are, therefore, by and large not applicable for analysis here. The division of parcel AR-55 that establishes separate parcels for separate utility facilities does not change the proposed location or function of these facilities. The change is in name only (as re-parceling) and is proposed to better match other comparable specific plans within the City's sphere of influence that have created separate parcels for separate Public/Quasi Public land uses. These facilities and their locations were previously analyzed in the EIR (FEIR, pp. 2-12, 2-18, 4.12.1-36 to 4.12.1-67, 4.12.2-5 to 4.12.2-10). Removal of the planned 60 kV electrical line along the Westbrook Boulevard and Road A from the ARSP will not impact utilities for the Project because that line was intended to service the planned neighboring community of Placer Ranch at a time when it was assumed that the City would annex that land and be the lead agency (FEIR, p. 4.12-5-3). However, Placer Ranch will remain in Placer County and obtain its electrical service in another manner (see Final EIR for Sunset Area Plan/Placer Ranch Specific Plan, SCH # #2016112012; specific plan adopted by Placer County Board of Supervisors on December 10, 2019 [Resolution 2019-241]). And, changes to the water transmission and drainage systems that will occur in the southeastern portion of the project site are so minor that the systems remain "largely unchanged," with water and drainage flows remaining "the same," thereby precluding environmental impacts to utilities and service systems as a result and actually lowering "water use factors and lower wastewater generation rates for the project" overall (see Utility Systems Updates Technical Memorandum, pp. 5, 10).

The one proposed Project modification that could impact utilities and service systems is the elimination of MM 4.12.1-1 and subsequent amendment of the MMRP—the original version of which was adopted by the City on June 15, 2016 (see Resolution No. 16-271). Consequently, only water supply is substantively discussed here because the measure being eliminated purported to mitigate impacts to water supply.

Impacts to water supply as a result of Project implementation are discussed in Section 4.12.1.4 of the EIR; MM 4.12.1-1 was adopted to reduce these impacts. (See Section 4.12.1.5.) The EIR addressed eight impacts to water supply, one of which was considered potentially significant (Impact 4.12.1-1) and two of which were considered significant and unavoidable in the cumulative scenario (Impact 4.12.1-4 and Impact 4.12.1-8). MM 4.12.1-1 was included to reduce Impact 4.12.1-1 to a less-than-significant level.

MM 4.12.1-1 requires that the Applicant provide a “proportionate share of required funding to the City” for water supply, with the City entering into an agreement with Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) to secure water supply for the Project. Constraints were put on the water source in that it need be: (1) “legally available and sufficient” to meet Project demands, (2) consistent with applicable regulations, (3) subject to environmental review, (4) approved by the agency with jurisdiction over the water, and (5) funded (FEIR, p. 4.12.1-67). In lieu of this mitigation established in 2016, the Applicant shall instead pay the City water connection fees that are required pursuant to a recent update of the City Municipal Code section 14.08.025 - Water connection fees (see Ord. 6100 § 2, 2019). Section 14.08.025 calculates water connection fees based on a “dwelling unit equivalent” (DUE) wherein the fee amount depends on whether the DUE is designated Low Density Residential or High Density Residential; connection fees are adjusted annually.

To determine if an effect would be significant under CEQA, a lead agency develops or adopts thresholds of significance, either generally or on a case-by-case basis, compliance with which means the impact would be less than significant (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15064(b)(2), 15064.7(a)–(b)). Here, the City adopts its water connection fee as the threshold of significance for impacts to water supply (i.e., for “determining whether a project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years”) because it creates a consistent standard by which usage, preservation, and maintenance of the local raw water supply can be measured and controlled to ensure sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project and the remainder of the City during normal and dry years while not depleting supplies (see Municipal Code § 14.08.025(a); CEQA Guidelines § 15064.7(d); FEIR, p. 4.12.1-39; see also Municipal Code § 14.09.020). Thus, compliance with section 14.08.025 ensures less-than-significant impacts to water supply. Compliance with regulatory programs, such as municipal codes, generally provide sufficient evidence under CEQA that an impact will not have an effect on the environment and therefore does not require mitigation (see *Mission Bay Alliance v. Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure* (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 160). Here, the Applicant must pay the water connection fee before the City will issue building permits for the planned development, therefore, compliance is ensured and impacts to water supply are less than significant—i.e., Impact 4.12.1-1 is reduced to less than significant without mitigation (see Municipal Code § 14.08.025(D); FEIR, p. 4.12.1-40). Further, as stated above, proposed modifications will result in “lower water use” overall (see Utility Systems Updates Technical Memorandum, p. 5).

Mitigation Measures: Proposed Project modifications will not increase the potential for new or more severe significant impacts to utilities and service systems, specifically water supply, because payment of the City water connection fee will ensure potential impacts (Impact 4.12.1-1) remain at a less-than-significant level; therefore no previous mitigation measures apply and no new mitigation is warranted.

Conclusion: Proposed Project modifications will not create any significant new or substantially more severe significant impacts to utilities and service systems, specifically water supply; no mitigation is required.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, threatened or rare species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	See EIR Section 4.8 (Vegetation and Wildlife) See also “Biological Resources” and “Purpose and Scope of Addendum” above	No	No	No	See EIR Section 4.8 (Vegetation and Wildlife) See also “Biological Resources” and “Purpose and Scope of Addendum” above
b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	See EIR Sections 4.1 Land Use and Agriculture), 4.8 (Vegetation and Wildlife), and 4.12.1 (Public Utilities Water) See also “Biological Resources,” “Land Use and Planning,” “Utilities and Service Systems,” and “Purpose and	No	No	No	See EIR Sections 4.1 Land Use and Agriculture), 4.8 (Vegetation and Wildlife), and 4.12.1 (Public Utilities Water) See also “Biological Resources,” “Land Use and Planning,” “Utilities and Service Systems,” and “Purpose and Scope of Addendum” above

	Scope of Addendum” above				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	See EIR Section 4.12.1 (Public Utilities Water) See also “Utilities and Service Systems” and “Purpose and Scope of Addendum” above	No	No	No	See also “Utilities and Service Systems” and “Purpose and Scope of Addendum” above

2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) Does the project have the potential to <u>substantially</u> degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, <u>substantially</u> reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, threatened or rare species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	See above.				

Discussion:

This section makes mandatory findings of significance only for those issue areas potentially impacted by proposed Project modifications, as described above and analyzed throughout this addendum. The previously certified EIR discloses all potential environmental impacts, their level of significance, and mitigation measures to reduce significance for the originally proposed Project; mandatory findings of significance for which can be found in Appendix B of the FEIR.

As discussed above in this addendum, no significant new or substantially more severe significant impacts would occur as a result of proposed Project modifications, and no new circumstance or information exist that would create significant impacts or require additional analysis. Therefore, there would be no additional and/or substantial adverse effect on, or additional and/or substantial degradation of, biological resources (habitat, species, and range of species) or human beings (directly or indirectly), or any new or more severe cumulatively considerable significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: See measures listed in each issue area discussion for those applicable to proposed Project modifications.

Conclusion: With implementation of applicable mitigation measures identified in the previously certified EIR and listed above under each issue area, proposed Project modifications would create no significant new or substantially more severe significant impacts to the relevant areas within these mandatory findings of significance categories.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Based on analysis conducted in this addendum and in the previously certified EIR, it is determined that implementation of proposed Project modifications, as described in this addendum, would not result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, either directly or as a result of new circumstances or information. The City may take the following actions in compliance with CEQA:

- Adopt the amended ARSP
- Approve the amended land use designations
- Approve the amended zoning designations
- Approve the amended large lot tentative subdivision map
- Approve the amended development agreement between City and Applicant
- Re-adopt the amended MMRP

In reviewing the site specific information provided for this project and acting as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that the findings of CEQA Section 15162 concerning the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR and the findings of CEQA Section 15164 concerning the decision to prepare an Addendum can be made. As supported by substantial evidence within the Addendum to the AMORUSO RANCH PROJECT SPECIFIC PLAN Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2013102057, certified on June 15, 2016), the Lead Agency makes the following findings:

No substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous EIR.

No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken.

There is no new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of due diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete.

Only minor technical changes or additions are necessary in order to deem the certified environmental document adequate.

Addendum Prepared by:

Gina McColl, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Development Services–Planning Division

Attachments:

1. Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR (available online at <https://www.roseville.ca.us> under Government/Departments & Divisions/Planning/Specific Plans, Planning Areas & Development Agreements/Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan)
2. Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (Amendment - Change Pages)
3. Utility Systems Updates Technical Memorandum
4. Amended Development Agreement