



ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number:	INFILL PCL 189 – EchoPark Automotive; File #PL21-0230
Project Location:	180 N Sunrise Avenue, Roseville, Placer County, CA 95661; APN 013-213-030-000
Project Description:	The proposed project will renovate an existing retail building that will be occupied by EchoPark Automotive, a reconditioning facility and automotive sales use. Modifications consist of exterior changes limited to a change in colors and interior remodeling. The project will also include construction of an approximate 2,000-square-foot car wash facility within the parking lot. The project entitlements include a Conditional Use Permit to allow auto sales and a car wash in the Community Commercial zoning district and a Design Review Permit Modification for the proposed changes.
Project Applicant:	Martin Walsh, Sonic Development, LLC
Property Owner:	I Think I Can LP
Lead Agency Contact:	Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner; Phone (916) 746-1309

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. This streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies. Section 15183(b) specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, (2) Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent, (3) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (4) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Furthermore, Section 15183(c) states that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, this environmental checklist demonstrates that the Project qualifies for review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 and does not need additional environmental review since the General Plan EIR, certified by the City Council on August 5, 2020, adequately addressed the Project's potential environmental effects.

Table of Contents

Project Description	3
Purpose and Scope of Checklist	5
Environmental Checklist	
I. Aesthetics	9
II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources	10
III. Air Quality	10
IV. Biological Resources	15
V. Cultural Resources	20
VI. Energy	24
VII. Geology and Soils	24
VIII. Greenhouse Gases	28
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	31
X. Hydrology and Water Quality	33
XI. Land Use and Planning	36
XII. Mineral Resources	36
XIII. Noise	37
XIV. Population and Housing	40
XV. Public Services	41
XVI. Recreation	42
XVII. Transportation	43
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	45
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	47
XX. Mandatory Findings of Significance	36
Environmental Determination	52
Attachments	52

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The 11.85-acre project site is located at 180 North Sunrise Avenue (APN 013-213-030-00), within the City's Infill planning area (see Figure 1). The site is surrounded by existing developed areas, including an automotive sales use to the north, N. Sunrise Avenue to the east, an automotive rental use to the south, and Interstate 80 freeway to the west.

Figure 1: Project Site



Background and Environmental Setting

The project site was zoned Planned Development for Commercial Auto Sales and Service (PD197). However, in 2003, the City Council approved a Rezone (file #RZ 00-13) to change the zoning designation of the site to its current Community Commercial (CC) zoning in order to allow Fry's Electronics (an electronics retail store) to occupy the site. Associated with this request was a Design Review Permit (file #DRP 01-17) to allow the construction of the existing, approximate 145,000-square-foot retail building with associated parking, lighting, and landscaping, as well as a Tree Permit (file #TP 02-31) to remove three (3) native oak trees that were located within the proposed building footprint. In accordance with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study leading to a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project, which determined impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant impact with mitigation.

The topography of the site consists of relatively mild slopes. The property has frontage on N. Sunrise Avenue, which is a four-lane major arterial roadway at this location. Access to the site is provided by a signalized driveway on N. Sunrise Avenue that intersects with Sierra Gardens Drive, as well as a second driveway approximately 250 feet south of the signalized driveway. Streetlights and fully constructed sidewalks with landscaping exist along N. Sunrise Avenue. Overhead power lines traverse the site along the western boundary adjacent to

Interstate 80. Native oak trees are located on the adjacent property, at the southwestern portion of the site. Table 1 identifies the zoning and land use designations of the adjacent properties.

Table 1: Adjacent Zoning and Land Use

Location	Zoning	General Plan Land Use	Current Use of Property
Site	Community Commercial (CC)	Community Commercial (CC)	Vacant (previously Fry's Electronics)
North	Planned Development for Commercial Auto Sales & Services (PD161)	CC	Hyundai Auto Sales
South	CC	CC	Enterprise Rent-A-Car
East	N. Sunrise Avenue with Planned Development for Commercial, Light Industrial and Office (PD16) and Planned Development for Low Traffic Generating Retail (PD156) beyond	Business Professional (BP) and CC	Post Office, Retail and Commercial Uses
West	N/A	N/A	Interstate 80

Proposed Project

The proposed project will renovate the existing building which will be occupied by EchoPark Automotive, a vehicle reconditioning and automotive sales use. As required by the Zoning Ordinance, the project entitlements include a Conditional Use Permit to allow automotive sales and a car wash in the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district. A Design Review Permit Modification is included to change the colors of the building's exterior and to construct an approximate 2,000-square-foot car wash building. The overall size of the retail building will remain the same at approximately 145,000 square feet. The car wash will be utilized by employees only. Minor modifications will be made to the parking lot and landscaping to accommodate the car wash building. There will be no impacts to any native oak trees. Figure 2 on the following page, includes the preliminary site plan for the Project. The project plans are included as Attachment 1.

mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring plan must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). When the project is a general plan or other plan-level document, the monitoring plan may be the annual plan implementation report required by statute, such as a report on general plan status (CEQA Guidelines Section 15097[b]).

The GP EIR identified the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- Vehicle Miles Traveled impacts
- Air Quality – Construction
- Air Quality – Operational
- Air Quality – Pollutant Concentrations
- Greenhouse Gases
- Noise and Vibration (short-term and long-term)
- Historical Resources
- Archeological Resources
- Disturbance of Human Remains
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Construction of Utilities (indirect impacts)
- Aesthetics
- Light and Glare

All of the above impacts were also found to be significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts, along with the following:

- Biological Resources – Special-status plants, riparian habitat/sensitive natural communities, or wetlands and other waters
- Biological Resources – Special-status wildlife species and habitats

The Project does not change the boundaries of the Planning Area or propose construction within areas that had not previously been anticipated for construction within the GP EIR. No changes are proposed to the land use or zoning designation of the site. Impacts to physical resources (such as agricultural land, biological resources, etc.) are based on the grading and development of an area, not on the proposed use types of the buildings (e.g., retail sales vs. automotive sales) on the property. For other types of impacts which are affected by use type and square footage, the Project results in negligible or the same level of potential impacts, as discussed in this checklist.

The Project is further exempt from environmental review per CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The General Plan EIR acknowledged the City's intent to adopt uniform standards applicable to all projects that could mitigate impacts, which would preclude a finding of peculiarity. Moreover, there is nothing peculiar about the Project, which involves retention of the existing building on site and construction of a small additional building of a car wash to serve only vehicles on the site. The main commercial building on the Property will be cosmetically improved, but not increased in size. The project will be substantially less intense than the previous retail sales use. No potential new impacts related to the Project have been identified that would necessitate further environmental review beyond the impacts and issues already disclosed and analyzed in the General Plan EIR. No other special circumstances exist that would create a reasonable possibility that the Project will have a significant adverse effect on the environment and, thus, no further environmental review is required. As the Project meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, the Project is statutorily exempt from further CEQA review.

In addition, the limited addition of a car wash to the property is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, which exempts minor alterations to existing structures and facilities, including Projects in an area

where all public services and facilities are available and any additions to existing structures will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet. Moreover, as provided in Guideline Section 15301, the key consideration here is not the location on the property of the car wash, but its size and whether it results in “negligible or no expansion of the former use.” Here, the main building remains the same size, and the car wash facility, approximately 2,000 square feet in size, is negligible under the guideline standard. The car wash does not serve to expand the existing building or use in any way.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 15183(B)

CEQA Guidelines §15183(b) states that, “In approving a project meeting the requirements of this section, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:

- (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located;
- (2) Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent;
- (3) Are potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action; or
- (4) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.”

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories within the parameters outlined above. The “Prior EIR” used for comparison is the GP EIR certified by the City Council on August 5, 2020 including all impact determinations and significance thresholds utilized therein. 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 the GP EIR.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Prior EIR Determination

This column identifies the determination made in the prior EIR relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic. The determination will be either no impact, less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable.

Effect Peculiar to Project?

Pursuant to Section 15183(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project will result in effects that are peculiar to the project that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review documents and related approvals.

New Significant Effect?

Pursuant to Section 15183(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the project will result in any new environmental effects that were not previously analyzed as significant effects in the GP EIR.

New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?

Pursuant to Section 15183(b)(3-4) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the Project would result in potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the GP EIR, or whether the impacts are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

DISCUSSION 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.

CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	No	No	No
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	SU	No	No	No
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	SU	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: Impacts related to substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista were found to be less than significant (GP EIR page 4.14-18) because there are no scenic vistas in the Planning Area. This evaluation remains adequate and is applicable to this Project.

There are no designated or eligible state scenic highways within or near the Planning Area, nor is the Planning Area visible from such a highway. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded there would be no impacts with respect to this topic (GP EIR page 4.14-18). This evaluation remains adequate and is applicable to this Project.

Impacts related to, in a non-urbanized area, substantially degrading the visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and in an urbanized area, conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, were found to be significant (GP EIR page 4.14-19). The significance determination was driven by the impacts to non-urbanized areas, where buildout of the Planning Area will convert large areas of open, undeveloped land to urban uses. The conversion of these grasslands and other areas on the western edge of the City are within Specific Plans, and those Specific Plan EIRs concluded that aesthetic impacts related to open space conversion would be significant. The GP EIR concludes that aesthetic impacts related to this criteria are significant and unavoidable due to the conversion of open space in a non-urbanized area. No mitigation measures were available, because conversion of open space is an unavoidable consequence of urbanization.

There is nothing peculiar to this Project or its site that would result in a conclusion different from that found in the GP EIR for this topic. The Project site is already developed and was previously occupied by an electronics retail store. The site is in an urban setting surrounded by existing developed properties. The City of Roseville has adopted Community Design Guidelines (CDG) to establish common design elements and expectations for development within the City. The CDG includes provisions related to architectural design, site design and landscape design, to enhance the visual character of the urban environment. The project has been reviewed by City staff and was found to be consistent with the goals and policies of the CDG and applicable zoning regulations.

The project involves nighttime lighting to provide for the security and safety of project users. However, the project is already located within an urbanized setting with many existing lighting sources. Lighting for the project is conditioned to comply with City standards (i.e., Community Design Guidelines) to limit the height of light standards and to require cut-off lenses and glare shields to minimize light and glare impacts. The project will not create a new source of substantial light. None of the project elements are highly reflective, and therefore the project will not contribute to an increased source of glare.

Based on the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	No	No	No
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	No	No	No
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact	No	No	No
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	No	No	No
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR indicates approximately 20 acres of Prime Farmland borders Pleasant Creek within Reason Farms. The remainder of the Planning Area is designated by the Placer County Important Farmland map as Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Other Land, and Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation 2016). These designations are not considered Important Farmland under CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21060.1 and 21095 and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G). The areas of Prime Farmland with Reason Farms is not proposed for conversion to urban land uses. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded buildout of the General Plan would not convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses and no impact would occur. This evaluation remains adequate and is applicable to this Project.

The Project site is not used for agricultural purposes, does not include agricultural zoning, is not within or adjacent to one of the areas of the City designated as a protected farmland category on the Placer County Important Farmland map, is not within or adjacent to land within a Williamson Act Contract, and is not considered forest land. Given the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

III. Air Quality

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	SU	No	No	No
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	SU	No	No	No
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	SU	No	No	No
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	SU	No	No	No
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	SU	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR evaluated construction-related activities, which would result in temporary emissions of criteria air pollutants (e.g., PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO) and ozone precursors (e.g., ROG and NO_x) from ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing); exhaust

emissions from use of off-road equipment, material delivery, and construction worker commutes; building construction; asphalt paving; and application of architectural coatings. The GP EIR also evaluated activities associated with the operation of General Plan land uses, which would generate criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions from mobile, energy, and area sources. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to estimate emissions resulting from both construction-related activities and operational activities. The GP EIR concluded that emissions would exceed the adopted Placer County Air Pollution Control District significance thresholds, and that even after application of mitigation these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The Project does not change the location or extent of land area which will be disturbed by construction, nor does it substantially increase the amount of building area which would be constructed (as discussed previously, the addition of the approximate 2,000-square-foot car wash building can be considered negligible per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301). Therefore, the project will result in no change to the construction-related analysis in the GP EIR.

The GP EIR found that emissions related to operation were significant and unavoidable, because VMT would exceed the significance threshold of 12.8 VMT/resident after the application of mitigation. The Project does not change the existing land use designations, nor does it change the total units analyzed or location and density of uses, which can have an effect on operational emissions related to transportation.

For substantial pollutant concentrations, the GP EIR found construction and operation of the General Plan would generate localized air pollutant emissions that could affect existing and proposed sensitive receptors. Construction activities would generate diesel particulate matter (diesel PM) emissions. Existing regulations and policies, as well as revised policies were found to reduce potential exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations, but impacts related to diesel particulates were found to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would not change the location or extent of construction activities, so would result in no change to this analysis. This evaluation remains adequate and is applicable to this Project.

For other emissions, the GP EIR found that buildout of the General Plan could involve actions which would expose people to objectionable odors. Construction-related activities would generate odors from the use of diesel-powered equipment and from paving and architectural coating activities. However, these odorous emissions would be temporary and disperse rapidly with distance from the source; therefore, construction-generated odors would not result in the frequent exposure of receptors to objectionable odor emissions. Future land uses could result in the operation of new land use that generates objectionable odors or the siting of sensitive receptors in proximity to existing odor-generating land uses within the Planning Area. Therefore, development under the General Plan could result in the exposure of receptors to objectionable odor emissions. Because buffer distances and implementation of specific technology- and design-based measures cannot be known at this time, it was conservatively assumed that sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial odor-generating emissions, and the GP EIR found impacts to be significant and unavoidable after the application of mitigation. The Project is located within an existing urban area developed with commercial uses and does not change the location and extent of urban development, nor is it located adjacent to any residential uses. Therefore, the GP EIR evaluation remains adequate and is applicable to this Project.

Based on the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: All of the mitigation measures below were effectuated through inclusion in the City's 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but are included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:**Implementation Measure**

Projects that could have a potentially significant effect, as demonstrated by exceedance of the PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance, shall incorporate applicable PCAPCD-recommended standard operational mitigation measures, as listed below or as they may be updated in the future, or those design features determined by the City to be as effective:

- Wood burning or pellet stoves shall not be permitted. Natural gas or propane fired fireplaces shall be clearly delineated on plans submitted to obtain building permits.
- Where natural gas is available, gas outlets shall be provided in residential backyards for use with outdoor cooking appliances such as gas barbeques.
- Electrical outlets should be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of residences to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.
- All newly constructed residential buildings including one- and two-family dwellings, townhomes, and multi-family units in low-rise and high-rise residential buildings shall comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen).
- Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) shall include the required distribution of educational information on how homeowners can increase energy efficiency and conservation in their new homes. The information shall be delivered as part of a “move-in” packet prior to occupancy of the residence.
- Streets should be designed to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops.
- Site design shall maximize access to transit, to accommodate bus travel, and to provide lighted shelters at transit access points.
- A pedestrian access network shall link complementary land uses.
- Provide bicycle storage to promote bicycling.
- Vanpool parking only spaces and preferential parking for carpools should be required for employment-generating uses.
- Consider using concrete or other non-polluting materials for paving parking lots instead of asphalt.
- Landscaping should be designed to eventually shade buildings and parking lots.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:**Implementation Measure**

If, following implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a, a project’s operational emissions would still exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance, the City would require the project to offset remaining project emissions in excess of thresholds by establishing off-site mitigation or participation in PCAPCD’s Off-site Mitigation Program.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

- The City shall require, as part of plans for development within the Planning Area, the implementation of ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective guidance concerning land use compatibility and recommended setback distances with regard to sources of TAC emissions and sensitive land uses, or related guidance as it may be updated in the future.
- As an alternative to these buffer distances, proposed sensitive receptors, uses that involve substantial truck trips, and large gas stations may provide a site-specific health risk assessment, using methods consistent with applicable guidance from the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, with mitigation, if necessary, to demonstrate compliance with applicable PCAPCD-recommended health risk thresholds. When health risk impacts exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds, feasible on-site mitigation measures to reduce TAC exposure shall be implemented to mitigate health risk impacts below PCAPCD-recommended thresholds. On-site measures could include but are not limited to providing enhanced filtration systems (e.g., MERV 13 or greater) for near-by sensitive receptor buildings, use of solid barriers to pollution, and vegetation to reduce pollutant concentrations, changes to the TAC emission source's operation (e.g. technology or management practices that reduce harmful emissions at the Rail Yard), and positioning of exhaust and intake for ventilation systems to minimize exposure, among others.
- The City shall require, as part of development of land uses associated with sensitive receptors within 500 feet of high-volume roadways (defined as roadways carrying an average of 100,000 or more vehicles per day), the incorporation of feasible design measures to reduce exposure by sensitive receptors of substantial emissions of TACs from nearby high-volume roadways and operation of the Roseville Rail Yard. Design measures shall include recommended strategies from the ARB Technical Advisory, as listed below or as they may be updated in the future, or those design features determined by the City to be as effective:
 - Design that promotes air flow and pollutant dispersion along street corridors, including the use of wider sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and dedicated transit lanes, which create space for better air flow and pollutant dispersion along with increasing active transportation and mode shift;
 - Installation of solid barriers, particularly in the downwind direction. Note that consideration of this strategy should also weigh the negative effect of dividing neighborhoods and obscuring sightlines.
 - Installation of vegetation for pollutant dispersion; maximum benefit of this strategy is typically seen when combined with solid barriers.
 - Installation of indoor high-efficiency filtration systems and devices to remove pollutants from the air. If this strategy is selected, a plan for ongoing operation and maintenance of the systems must also be developed to ensure long-term efficiency is achieved as intended by the system.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-5 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:**Implementation Measure**

All new Specific Plans and proposed amendments to Specific Plans shall be evaluated for odor impacts using the SMAQMD-recommended screening distances for odor sources, or the most current adopted or recommended version. If the minimum buffer distance is not feasible, as an alternative to these buffer distances, technology- and design-based measures shall be evaluated as part of the Specific Plan design guidelines to minimize, contain, or prevent the generation of odor-causing emissions and the dispersion of such emissions to nearby sensitive receptors. For

example, in the case of siting odor-producing sources, activities could be maintained within an enclosed space and appropriate air filtration systems could be implemented to reduce odors expelled from the building. For developments that would host sensitive receptors, design would include air site layout, landscaping, indoor air filtration systems, or other appropriate measures to minimize exposure of proposed sensitive receptors to odors.

IV. Biological Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
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?	LTSM	No	No	No
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?	LTSM	No	No	No
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	LTSM	No	No	No
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	LTSM	No	No	No
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	LTS	No	No	No
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community	LTS	No	No	No

Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
---	--	--	--	--

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR concluded impacts related to the loss and degradation of special-status plants and their habitats were potentially significant (GP EIR page 4.8-60) as were impacts to special-status wildlife and their habitats (GP EIR page 4.8-64), impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities (GP EIR page 4.8-70), impacts to protected wetlands and other waters (GP EIR page 4.8-73), and impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites (GP EIR page 4.8-76) because buildout of the General Plan could result in direct removal or take of special-status species; modification or removal of sensitive habitats, wildlife corridors, nursery sites, protected waters, and habitats suitable for special-status species; indirect effects to species or habitats that may result from construction-related runoff, sedimentation, erosion, and introduction of invasive weeds; and the introduction of new sources of noise and light. Implementation of mitigation, combined with General Plan policies and existing laws and regulations, were found to reduce impacts to less than significant levels, because new development would be required to identify, avoid, and preserve sensitive habitats, wildlife corridors, nursery sites, protected waters, and habitats which may support special-status populations to the extent feasible, and compensate for the loss of these resources through preservation, compensation, or other appropriate measures in coordination with state and federal agencies. Furthermore, the City’s Specific Planning process has already resulted in the creation of connected open space corridors throughout the Planning Area which contain much of the sensitive habitat in the Planning Area.

Impacts related to conflicts with local ordinances protecting biological resources were found to be less than significant (GP EIR page 4.8-79) because while buildout of the Planning Area would result in impacts to biological resources, all development would be subject to and consistent with the City’s ordinances and policies such as the Tree Preservation Ordinance. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with local ordinances were found to be less than significant.

Impacts related to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved Conservation Plan were found to be less than significant because there are no adopted plans which apply to the Planning Area.

All of the analyses described above are based on the potential impacts of grading and general development within the Planning Area, and the Project neither changes the boundaries of the Planning Area nor the locations of potential grading and development within the Planning Area. In addition, the Project does not result in the removal of any protected native oak trees and there are no existing wetland features or designated open space areas on the site. Therefore, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: All of the mitigation measures below were effectuated through inclusion in the City’s 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but are included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:**Implementation Measure for Special-Status Plants and Habitat**

As appropriate to each individual project or Specific Plan, the following actions or those determined to be equally as effective by the City shall be implemented where there may be an adverse impact on special-status plants or habitat:

- a. In conjunction with environmental review pursuant to CEQA, for projects that could directly affect special-status plants or habitat, the City shall require that resource field surveys, including special-status plant surveys, be submitted concurrent with development applications inventorying the type, quantity, and quality of existing open space resources and conditions. This requirement may be waived if determined by the City that the proposed project area is already sufficiently surveyed, is within an adopted specific plan area, or contains resources considered less than significant.
- b. The City and project proponents will identify feasible opportunities to preserve special-status plant species occurrences and sensitive habitats through design and planning.
- c. If the City determines it is reasonable and feasible to do so, the City will require preservation of occupied special-status plant species habitat and sensitive habitat types as a condition of project approval. If adverse effects cannot be avoided, project proponents shall be required to mitigate all adverse effects in accordance with guidance from the appropriate state or federal agency charged with the protection of the subject species and habitat, including surveys conducted according to applicable standards and protocols, where necessary, implementation of impact minimization measures based on accepted standards and guidelines and best available science, and compensatory mitigation for unavoidable loss of special-status plant species and sensitive habitats.
- d. If the project would result in take of state or federally listed species, the City will require project proponent/s to obtain take authorization from the USFWS and/or the CDFW, as appropriate, depending on species status, and comply with all conditions of the take authorization.
- e. The City will require project proponents to develop and implement a mitigation and monitoring plan reflective of permit conditions required by State and/or federal regulatory agencies, to compensate for effects to or loss of special-status species and sensitive habitats. The mitigation and monitoring plan will describe in detail how impacts to special-status species or sensitive habitats shall be avoided or offset, including details on restoration and creation of habitat, compensation for the temporal loss of habitat, management and monitoring to avoid indirect habitat degradation (e.g., management of invasive plant species, maintenance of required hydrology), success criteria ensuring that habitat function goals and objectives are met and target special-status species cover and density parameters are established, performance standards to ensure success, and remedial actions if performance standards are not met. The plan will include detailed information on the habitats present within the preservation and mitigation areas, the long-term management and monitoring of these

habitats, legal protection for the preservation and mitigation areas (e.g., conservation easement, declaration of restrictions), and funding mechanism information (e.g., endowment).

- f. If available, purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank (i.e., approved by the agency with jurisdiction over the affected species or habitat) in Placer County, will be acceptable for compensatory mitigation for special-status species.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure for Special-Status Wildlife

If feasible, the City will require preservation of occupied special-status wildlife species habitat and sensitive habitat types as a condition of project approval. If adverse effects cannot be avoided, project proponents shall be required to mitigate all adverse effects in accordance with guidance from the appropriate state or federal agency charged with the protection of the subject species and habitat, including surveys conducted according to applicable standards and protocols, where necessary, implementation of impact minimization measures based on accepted standards and guidelines and best available science, and compensatory mitigation for unavoidable loss of special-status wildlife species and sensitive habitats.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure for Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities

If a proposed project would result in fill or alteration of a waterway or any body of water supporting riparian forest habitat, the City will require project proponent/s to notify the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement if determined necessary by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and comply with all conditions of the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. Measures for riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities protection include, but are not limited to, avoid impacts by establishing a buffer zone between adjacent land uses and riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities; protect and preserve riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities to the extent feasible; and compensate for loss of riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities by creating, restoring, or preserving off-site habitat in coordination with the applicable resource agencies.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure for Wetlands and Other Waters

If a project would result in ground disturbance on sites containing waterways or other aquatic habitats, the City will require project proponent/s to complete a delineation of waters of the United States according to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' methods, and to submit the completed delineation to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for jurisdictional determination. If the project would result in fill of wetlands or other waters of the United

States, the City will require project proponent/s to obtain a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. If the project involves work in areas containing waters disclaimed by the USACE, project applicants shall obtain a Waste Discharge Requirement permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to the Porter Cologne Act. Project applicants shall be required to obtain all needed permits prior to project implementation, to abide by the conditions of the permits, including all mitigation requirements, and to implement all requirements of the permits in the timeframes required therein.

V. Cultural Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	SU	No	No	No
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	SU	No	No	No
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	SU	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				
<p>Discussion: In order to identify known and potential historical resources to determine whether any buildings, structures, objects, districts, or sites had been previously recorded or evaluated in the Planning Area for the GP EIR, Historic Property Data Files for Placer County were examined, along with the current and previous General Plan, various Specific Plans and their environmental documents and technical appendices, and the City of Roseville Municipal Code. In addition to these standard sources of information, summaries of Record Search results for selected specific plans and projects were also used. A similar process was used for archaeological resources, including the evaluation of studies completed for Specific Plans and other projects.</p> <p>Impacts related to adverse changes to the significance of a historical resource were found to be significant, as were adverse changes in the significance of an archeological resource and adverse impacts related to the disturbance of human remains because the Planning Area is known to contain resources and is also sensitive for the undiscovered presence of historic resources, archeological resources, and human remains. Although the General Plan, the City’s Specific Plans, and the City’s Zoning Ordinance contain goals and policies which require identification and assessment of potential resources in advance of development, impacts to resources could nonetheless occur. Grading and site development within the Planning Area has the potential to impact undiscovered subsurface historic and archeological resources, as well as human remains – particularly remains which are interred outside of formal cemeteries. The GP included policy revisions to further strengthen protections and the GP EIR included mitigation measures to address these impacts, but nonetheless impacts could still occur. Therefore impacts to historic resources, archeological resources, and human remains were found to remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>All of the analyses described above are based on the potential impacts of grading and general development within the Planning Area, and the Project neither changes the boundaries of the Planning Area nor the locations of potential grading and development within the Planning Area. Therefore, the GP EIR analyses of cultural resources adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. There are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.</p>				

Mitigation Measures: All of the mitigation measures below were effectuated through inclusion in the City's 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but are included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

As appropriate to each individual project or Specific Plan, the following actions or those determined to be equally as effective by the City shall be implemented where there may be an adverse impact on potential historical resources:

- a. Consult the City's Master List of Historical Resources Inventory and, as necessary, seek updated information from the North Central Information Center or other applicable data repositories to determine whether the project area has been surveyed, and whether historic built environment resources were identified.
- b. If a survey of the property or the area in which the property is located has not been conducted, a qualified architectural historian shall conduct a study of the project area for the presence of historic built environment resources.
- c. If a study is required, it will evaluate the significance of built environment resources greater than 45 years in age that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities. The study may include a field survey; background, archival and historic research; and consultation with local historical societies, museums or other interested parties; as necessary.
- d. If necessary, the qualified architectural historian's study will recommend appropriate protection or mitigative treatment, if any, and include recordation of identified built environment resources. Recommended treatment for historical resources identified in the report shall be implemented.
- e. If no significant historic built environment resources are identified in the study or prior survey of the project area that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, there is no adverse change to documented built environment historical resources and no further action is required.
- f. If a significant built environment historical resource could be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, avoidance shall be considered the primary mitigation option. If avoidance is not feasible, then the maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of the historical resource, conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. If adherence to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards cannot avoid materially altering in an adverse manner the physical characteristics or historic character of the surrounding environmental setting that contribute to a resource's historic significance, additional mitigation may be required.

- g. If avoidance is not feasible and minimizing impacts through adherence to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties is not feasible, documentation is required using, as appropriate, Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and/or Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) guidelines before the property is potentially altered during project activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2a – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources shall be required to assess impacts and provide feasible mitigation. The following steps, or those determined to be equally as effective by the City, will be followed:

- a. Request information from the California Native American Heritage Commission to obtain a review of the Sacred Lands File and a list of local Native American groups and individuals that may have specific knowledge of cultural resources in the area that could be affected by project implementation. Each Native American group and individual identified by the Native American Heritage Commission will be contacted to obtain any available information on cultural resources in the project area. Additional consultation with relevant tribal representatives may be appropriate, depending on the relative level of cultural sensitivity, as identified by Native American groups or individuals.
- b. Request updated information from the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (California State University, Sacramento) to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether archaeological resources were identified. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted or existing survey data is greater than five years old, the applicant will retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to assess the adequacy of the existing data (if any) and assess the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. If the survey did not meet current professional standards or regulatory guidelines, or relies on outdated information, a qualified archaeologist will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the project area for archaeological resources.
- c. If a survey is warranted, it will include all necessary background research, including that resulting from consulting with traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes in addition to an archaeological pedestrian survey. Based on findings of the survey, additional technical studies may be required, such as geoarchaeological sensitivity analysis, or other analysis scaled according to the nature of the individual project. A report will document the results of the survey and provide appropriate management recommendations, and include recordation of identified archaeological resources on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports.

- d. Management recommendations may include, but are not limited to additional studies to evaluate identified sites or archaeological monitoring at locations determined by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with culturally affiliated California Native American tribes to be sensitive for subsurface cultural resource deposits. The City will determine the need for tribal monitoring based upon the guidance provided in Volume I of the City's Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation.
- e. Once approved by the City, provide the North Central Information Center with appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports for any resources identified. Any subsequent reports completed as a result of additional technical work will likewise be submitted to the Northcentral Information Center.
- f. If no archeological resources, including those which are TCRs or are associated with a TCR, are identified that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, mitigation is complete as there would be no adverse change to documented archeological resources. The exception would be in the event of the discovery of a previously unknown archaeological site inadvertently exposed during project implementation. In such an event, a qualified archaeologist will be retained to assess the discovery and provide management recommendations as necessary, in accordance with the City's Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation Section 3.2.
- g. When a project will impact a known archaeological site, including those determined to be a TCR, and avoidance is not a feasible option, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes, shall evaluate the eligibility of the site for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. If the archaeological site is found to be a historical resource as per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(3), the qualified archaeologist shall recommend further mitigative treatment, which could include preservation in place or data recovery, consistent with Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation Section 3.2.4.
- h. If a site to be tested is prehistoric, the City should determine the need for tribal monitoring based upon the guidance provided in Volume I of the Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation Section 2.4.4.
- i. Appropriate mitigation may include curation of artifacts removed during subsurface testing, consistent with the City's Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation.
- j. If significant archaeological resources that meet the definition of historical or unique archaeological resources, including those determined by the City to be TCRs, are identified in the project area, the preferred mitigation of impacts is preservation in place. If impacts cannot be avoided through project design, appropriate and feasible treatment measures are required, which may consist of, but are not limited to actions, such as data recovery excavations. If only part of a site will be impacted by a project, data recovery will only be necessary for that portion of the site. Data recovery will not be required if the implementing agency determines prior testing and studies have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from the resources. Studies and reports resulting from

the data recovery shall be deposited with the North Central Information Center. Archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, as outlined in the City’s Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2b – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to undiscovered, potentially significant archaeological resources and/or TCRs which may be discovered during construction shall be required to implement the Post-Review Discovery Procedures within Volume II Part C of the City’s Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation, or those determined to be equally as effective by the City.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation

Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to human remains or potential human remains shall implement the applicable procedures and recommended mitigation within the City’s Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-4

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 (Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to human remains or potential human remains shall implement the applicable procedures and recommended mitigation within the City’s Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation).

VI. Energy

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or	LTS	No	No	No

unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR analyzed energy impacts by assessing energy usage associated with the construction and operation of projects developed as part of buildout of the General Plan. Energy demand was calculated consistent with the greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions modeling (see Greenhouse Gases section of this Addendum). The analysis found that fuel consumed by construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand, and further concluded that there are no anticipated unusual characteristics of buildout that would necessitate the use of equipment that is less energy-efficient than for other comparable projects. For building energy use, energy efficiency requirements will become more stringent over time, as they have in the past, so new projects will be more efficient than existing projects of the same type on the Planning area. These conclusions remain appropriate to describe the Project, because the Project does not change the location or extent of construction, the Project is consistent with the existing Community Commercial land use designation, and has therefore been assumed for development with commercial uses in the GP EIR. The Project is therefore consistent with the current Citywide assessment of energy demand, and will not result in substantial unplanned demands. Automotive sales and a car wash is a typical land use for a commercial zone that does not result in unusual energy demand characteristics.

The GP EIR found all projects within the Planning Area would be required to comply with the California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code in effect at the time of building permit application, and would therefore not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficient. This remains applicable to the Project.

The GP EIR concluded that buildout would not result in significant impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary project construction, and impacts would be less than significant. This conclusion and the supporting analysis remains appropriate and applicable to the Project.

Given the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

VII. Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Ruptures of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	No Impact	No	No	No
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	LTS	No	No	No
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	LTS	No	No	No
iv. Landslides?	No Impact	No	No	No
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	LTS	No	No	No
c. Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	LTS	No	No	No
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No Impact	No	No	No
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	LTSM	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				

Discussion: The analysis prepared for the GP EIR relied on published geologic literature and maps, NRCS soil survey data, and a records search performed at the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). The information obtained from those sources was reviewed and summarized to present the existing conditions and to identify potential environmental impacts. The GP EIR indicated impacts due to surface fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, or the use of septic systems did not require analysis because these risks were not evident (GP EIR page 4.7-27). The Planning Area does not include fault traces, soils subject to liquefaction or landslide hazards, and new development is required to connect to sewer systems.

Impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking were found to be less than significant (GP EIR page 4.7-28) because the evidence indicates strong shaking is unlikely and implementation of existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards goals and policies, in combination with compliance with the geologic and seismic requirements in the California Building Code (which the City has adopted), and the City's site-specific Design Review process (as set forth in the City's Design Standards Section 2, General Requirements), would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to people or structures related to seismic shaking.

Impacts due to soil erosion were found to be less than significant (GP EIR page 4.7-29) because compliance with existing stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations and implementation of policies in the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update would reduce the soil erosion impact by requiring applicants to implement BMPs based on the City's *Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction*, develop and implement a SWPPP, comply with the City's Grading Ordinance, comply with the City's Design and Construction Standards, and comply with the avoidance and minimization measures contained in the Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan, all of which are specifically designed to minimize construction-related soil erosion and degradation of water quality to the maximum extent feasible.

Impacts due to unstable and expansive soils were found to be less than significant (GP EIR page 4.7-31) because implementation of General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards goals and policies and compliance with existing laws and regulations, including Section 111 (Grading) of the City's Design and Construction Standards related to soil testing for earthwork and backfill, would address issues related to unstable and expansive soils by requiring new construction to prepare site-specific geotechnical reports to identify areas of unstable soil and shrink-swell potential, and to follow design specifications contained in the CBC and standard engineering practices to prevent adverse impacts associated with these limitations.

Impacts related to the damage or destruction of unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features were found to be potentially significant (GP EIR page 4.7-32) because the Planning Area contains geologic formations known to be sensitive for paleontological resources and grading could damage these resources. As mitigation, General Plan Goal OS4.1 was revised and Policy OS4.11 was added to provide guidance and protection for paleontological resources. After mitigation, impacts were found to be less than significant.

All of the analyses described above are based on the potential impacts of grading within the Planning Area, and the Project neither changes the boundaries of the Planning Area nor the locations of potential grading within the Planning Area. The Project site has already been graded and developed, and would require minor grading to accommodate the proposed car wash building. Therefore, the GP EIR analyses of geology, soils, and paleontological resources adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. Based on the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measure below was effectuated through inclusion in the City’s 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but is included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Paleontological Resources

Where there is potential for a significant impact to paleontological resources:

1. Consult the Paleontological Sensitivity Map.
2. For projects located in geologic units that are not identified as paleontologically sensitive and which do not involve ground disturbance to a depth greater than 5 feet below the ground surface, no further actions related to paleontological resources shall be required.

For projects that would be located in paleontologically sensitive geologic units, or those that would be located in non-paleontologically sensitive surficial units but would involve ground disturbance to a depth greater than 5 feet, provide a site-specific analysis of the project’s potential to damage or destroy unique paleontological resources, and measures designed to protect unique paleontological resources, as needed and appropriate. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, construction worker personnel training, periodic monitoring during construction activities, stopping work within 50 feet of any fossil that is discovered, evaluation of the fossil by a qualified paleontologist, and proper recordation and curation of the specimen.

VIII. Greenhouse Gases

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	SU	No	No	No
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	SU	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				

Discussion: The GP EIR used CalEEMod to estimate GHG emissions which would result from construction and operation of completed land uses consistent with General Plan buildout. The construction emissions were summed and then amortized over a 30-year operational lifetime and added to the operational emissions associated with buildout. Thresholds of significance were developed for the GP EIR based on statewide demographics and data adjusted for land uses relevant in the City of Roseville. The GP EIR evaluation found existing conditions emissions of 5.13 MT CO₂e per service population (a combination of residents and employees) and that this would be reduced slightly to 5.12 MT CO₂e per service population in cumulative buildout conditions. This value exceeds the significance thresholds for the years 2020, 2035, and 2050 (5.07, 2.25, and 0.83 MT CO₂e per service population, respectively). The evaluation further found that mobile emissions from transportation sources account for approximately 67% of citywide emissions and that emissions resulting from the operation of buildings (energy) were the next-largest sector, at approximately 19% of citywide emissions. The GP EIR found that GHG emissions were significant and unavoidable after the application of mitigation. The mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, and 4.5-1c) were effectuated through inclusion in the City's 2035 General plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures.

There is nothing peculiar to the Project or its site that would result in a conclusion that differs from that found in the GP EIR related to GHG. The Project would include land uses consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Therefore, the conclusions made in the GP EIR remain applicable to the Project and no further analysis is warranted for this topic.

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measures below were effectuated through inclusion in the City's 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but is included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a.

Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c. The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Area Sources

- The City shall utilize electric landscape maintenance equipment to the extent feasible on parks and public/quasi-public lands.
- The installation of wood-burning fireplaces or appliances in new development shall not be permitted.

Energy

- The City will pursue within existing and future City facilities and may partner with other public agencies and organizations to promote replacement of appliances and office equipment with energy-efficient models with a priority from highest to lowest in terms of typical GHG reductions, on: water heater, vending machine, copier, refrigerator, printer, dishwasher, water cooler, computer, and clothes washer.

- The City will pursue improvements to existing and future City facilities and may partner with other public agencies and organizations to implement comprehensive building efficiency improvements, inclusive of, but not limited to, implement lighting efficiency upgrades, improved building temperature controls, building air sealing, duct air sealing and duct replacement, upgrading and/or insulating water heaters, ensuring proper functioning and efficiency of heating and air conditioning systems, reducing heat loss through and around windows, installation of cool roofs, and implementing energy conservation education.
- The City will support education and outreach to promote rebates, incentives, and other programs (as they become available) which would promote reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, and use available information on rebates used by consumers to determine where to focus education and outreach, including programs designed to promote electric appliances and replace natural gas appliances, and programs related to lighting.
- The City will promote the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Energy Efficient Mortgage (EEM) program and similar programs that assist buyers in purchasing homes meeting energy-efficiency criteria.
- The City will partner with other agencies and organizations to expand the City's urban forest to promote sequestration, but also with a focus on selection and placement that reduces the need for air conditioning and the urban heat island effect.

Land Use and Transportation

- The City will direct its own investments and review proposed development projects to reduce vehicular travel demand, promote non-vehicular travel, and facilitate local purchase and use of electric vehicles.
- The City will continue to direct its own investments and pursue outside funding for infrastructure and operational programs to promote ease and convenience of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel for daily trips.
- The City will integrate its land use and transportation planning and review and condition proposed projects to better situate residents in proximity to workplaces, goods and services, and recreational opportunities, making updates to implementing plans, such as the Capital Improvement Program, Bicycle Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, Transportation Systems Management program, transportation impact fee program, and transit plans.
- The City will support applications for affordable housing funds from agencies that reward and incentivize good planning, such as infill housing and housing built close to jobs, transportation, and amenities.
- The City will partner with other agencies and proposed developments to expand bicycle parking and other facilities, pedestrian facilities and amenities, and electric vehicle charging stations, with a focus on daily destinations.

The City will support a reduction of parking requirements for projects with a location, design, surrounding mix of uses, access to non-vehicular transportation facilities, and/or ongoing travel demand management programs that would reduce the need for vehicular trips.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment though reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	LTS	No	No	No
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	LTS	No	No	No
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	LTS	No	No	No
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	LTS	No	No	No
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	LTS	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				

Discussion: The GP EIR analyses in this section considered the range and nature of foreseeable hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal resulting from implementation of the General Plan, and identified the primary ways that hazardous materials could expose individuals or the environment to health and safety risks.

The GP EIR included a preliminary review of environmental risk databases, but because the analysis is at the programmatic level it did not include sampling, site-specific review, laboratory analysis, or inspection of buildings or site surfaces. Sites within the Planning Area with potential environmental hazards were identified based on information obtained from the Cortese List (including SWRCB's GeoTracker database and DTSC's EnviroStor database), the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) Public Map Viewer, and a review of California Important Farmlands mapped by the Department of Conservation. In addition, the Placer County Department of Environmental Health maintains lists of hazardous material sites, releases, and accident occurrences. The methodology for determining wildfire hazards included a review of aerial photographs, and a review of CAL FIRE's fire hazard severity zone maps.

There are no hazardous cleanup sites of record within 1,000 feet of the Project site according to both the State Water Resources Control Envirostor database (<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor database (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>). The Project is not located on a site where existing hazardous materials have been identified, and the project does not have the potential to expose individuals to hazardous materials.

Impacts related to airport safety and noise hazards were found to be less than significant because the nearest airport is approximately 6.3 miles southwest of the Planning Area. The impacts of the Project are consistent with this conclusion as the Project is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport.

Impacts related to the creation of significant hazard through routine transport, use, or disposal or possible release of hazardous materials from upset or accident conditions were found to be less than significant because while population growth and new businesses in the Planning Area would increase the potential for exposure to impacts, implementation of General Plan policies combined with compliance with existing federal and state regulations would ensure impacts would not be substantial. The same conclusion was reached for impacts related to handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Regulations governing the transport, use, disposal, and handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, are detailed and stringent at both the federal and state level, and are developed and adopted to ensure that adverse health and safety impacts are prevented. TA Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) is required of uses that handle toxic and/or hazardous materials in quantities regulated by the California Health and Safety Code and/or the City. Businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials are required to complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) pursuant to local, State, or federal requirements. The impacts of the Project are consistent with these conclusions as the Project will be required to comply with all local, State and federal requirements for the handling of hazardous materials, which will ensure less-than-significant impacts.

Buildout of the General Plan would add additional traffic and residences requiring evacuation in case of an emergency. The GP EIR found implementation of General Plan policies was found to ensure conformance with local emergency-response programs and continued cooperation with emergency-response service providers. In addition, while buildout of the General Plan was found to have a potential to increase risk to fire for both people and property, implementation of General Plan policies and actions, along with existing regulations was found to ensure that people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss of injury involving fires. Impacts were found to be less than significant. The Project

is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services and has already been incorporated into emergency response plans. The City does not have any areas which are at increased risk of wildfire hazard. Therefore, the GP EIR conclusion related to emergency response plans and wildfire hazard remain appropriate and applicable to describe the impacts of the Project.

Based on the foregoing, there are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	LTS	No	No	No
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site;	LTS	No	No	No
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner	LTS	No	No	No

which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				
iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	LTS	No	No	No
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	LTS	No	No	No
e. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiches zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR described potential impacts related to surface and groundwater hydrology and water quality, along with flooding, in the Planning Area. The analysis used the City’s floodplain mapping (which includes Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplains); the 303(d) list of waterbodies impaired by pollution according to the State Water Resources Control Board; and a review of applicable watershed management, groundwater management, and restoration plans; and the environmental documentation provided for the City’s Specific Plans.

Impacts related to violation of water quality standards or conflict with a water quality control plan were found to be less than significant because while buildout of the Planning Area would introduce uses which could result in additional discharges of pollutants, the policies of the General Plan combined with current land use stormwater, grading, and erosion control laws, along with regulations and permit conditions would ensure that significant impacts associated with violation of standards or conflicts with water quality control plans would not occur.

Impacts related to substantial interference with groundwater recharge or decrease in water supplies that would impede implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan were found to be less than significant because while buildout of the Planning Area would result in additional impervious surfaces and therefore could reduce infiltration to groundwater, the Planning Area soils are substantially impermeable and only provide low levels of groundwater recharge. In addition, while development would result in the use of additional water, some of which could be from groundwater sources, the City’s Urban Water Master Plan and the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan provide for sustainable management of groundwater supplies.

Impacts related to substantial alteration of drainage patterns resulting in substantial erosion or siltation were found to be less than significant because while construction and grading could result in runoff of soils and soil erosion, implementation of General Plan policies and existing regulations will ensure that substantial impacts do not result.

Impacts related to substantial alteration of drainage patterns resulting in runoff that would exceed the capacity of stormwater systems, cause an increase in flooding, or provide additional sources of polluted runoff were found to be less than significant because while buildout of the Planning Area would increase impervious surfaces and contribute to increased runoff, which could contribute additional pollutants, result in

hydromodification, or increased flood potential, implementation of General Plan policies combined with current drainage and flood control regulations ensures that impacts are not substantial.

Impacts related to release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones were found to be less than significant because General Plan policy and the City's development regulations do not permit permanent storage of materials within flood hazard zones, and temporary storage is only permitted with a Flood Encroachment Permit, part of the purpose of which is to ensure there will be no impacts to the floodplain or water quality. In addition, the Planning Area is not near any water bodies which pose a tsunami or seiche hazard.

The analyses described above are based on the potential impacts of grading and general development within the Planning Area, and the Project neither changes the boundaries of the Planning Area nor the locations of potential grading and development within the Planning Area. Therefore, the GP EIR analyses of hydrology and water quality adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project.

The Project will involve modifications to the existing impervious surfaces (e.g., asphalt paving) to accommodate the proposed car wash building. The developer is required to receive approval of a grading permit and/or improvement plans prior to the start of construction. The permit or plans are required to incorporate mitigation measures for dust and erosion control. In addition, the City has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board which requires the City to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. The City does this, in part, by means of the City's 2016 Design/Construction Standards, which require preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. All permanent stormwater quality control measures must be designed to comply with the City's Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development, the City's 2016 Design/Construction Standards, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, and Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

The Project does not involve the installation of groundwater wells. The Project includes adequate and appropriate facilities to ensure no net increase in the amount or rate of stormwater runoff from the site, and which will adequately convey stormwater flows. The Project is not located within either the Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain or the City's Regulatory Floodplain (defined as the floodplain which will result from full buildout of the City). Therefore, the project will not impede or redirect flood flows, nor will it be inundated. The Project is located within an area of flat topography and is not near a waterbody or other feature which could cause a seiche or tsunami.

Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XI. Land Use and Planning

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Physically divide an established community?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	LTS	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				
<p>Discussion: The GP EIR found that buildout of the General Plan would not physically divide the community, because the City’s land use designations, roadway locations, transit systems, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways have been and will continue to be planned (per General Plan policy) comprehensively through the Specific Plan process to provide connected communities. Impacts were found to be less than significant. The Project does not include changes to any of the City’s existing or planned roads, other paths of travel, or community connectivity.</p> <p>The GP EIR included an analysis of potential inconsistencies between the General Plan and other land use plans, policies, or regulations, including with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), SACOG Blueprint, Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission, new Specific Plans, the Zoning Ordinance, and the Roseville/Placer County Memorandum of Understanding. In all cases, it was determined there were no inconsistencies between the General Plan and other plans that would result in significant impacts; impacts were found to be less than significant. The Project is consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation of the subject property. The City’s Design Review and Conditional Use Permit standards, as well as City-required Conditions of Approval would ensure that the proposed project would be developed in conformance with all applicable land use plans and ordinances, and would not conflict with any agency’s plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				

XII. Mineral Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact	No	No	No
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact	No	No	No
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				
<p>Discussion: The City of Roseville does not overlie any known deposits of economically valuable mineral resources (Loyd 1995), and the City does not have a Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) permit. No mining activities are currently underway nor does the City anticipate that any mining activities will take place in the future. Therefore, mineral resources were not evaluated in the GP EIR.</p> <p>The project site is not in the area of the City known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				

XIII. Noise

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	SU	No	No	No
b. Generation of excessive ground borne vibration of ground borne noise levels?	LTS	No	No	No
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or	LTS	No	No	No

working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable				

Discussion: The GP EIR identified noise conditions for new noise-sensitive developments within areas with the potential to be affected by substantial existing or future transportation noise sources and stationary noise sources. Existing conditions were compared to cumulative buildout conditions, based on existing and future General Plan land uses. The methodology used for this analysis was consistent with approaches recommended by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the City of Roseville. Noise modeling was conducted using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) traffic noise prediction model (FHWA-RD-77-108) and the FTA's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance Manual (2018). Stationary-source noise levels were obtained from manufacturer specifications and industry-standard technical reports. Traffic data from the traffic impact analysis prepared for buildout of the General Plan were used to model existing and future traffic noise levels.

The Planning Area does not intersect with any military bases, special use airspaces, or low-level flightpaths and is not located in safety zones or noise contours associated with airfields or airports that are a concern for land use compatibility planning. The Planning Area is not located within 2 miles of a public or private airstrip. Therefore, impacts due to these issues were found to be less than significant without the need for detailed analysis. This evaluation does not require updating and is adequate for the Project.

The GP EIR evaluated the potential for temporary, short-term noise and vibration impacts due to construction. The analysis found that while buildout of the General Plan would involve noise associated with construction and some level of vibration due to typical construction practices, the City's Noise Ordinance limits construction to daytime hours, because these are outside of the recognized sleep hours for residents and are also outside of evening and early morning hours and time periods when residents are most sensitive to noise and vibration. The analysis recognizes that the City's Noise Ordinance and General Plan policy ensure that the impact of construction is reduced to the extent practicable, given that construction cannot be avoided and is a necessary part of development. The GP EIR concluded that vibration levels from construction were less than significant, because large-scale projects with extensive excavation and pile driving are not contemplated near vibration-sensitive uses. However, construction noise could cause significant impacts, and additional mitigation is not available. Construction noise impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. The Project does not change the location or intensity of construction activities within the City and does not affect the maximum daily noise generation. Maximum daily noise is based on the maximum amount of land area or building area that can feasibly be developed during any given day, so while the addition of the car wash building may increase the duration of a construction project, it does not change the amount of construction per day or the intensity of construction.

The GP EIR analysis of permanent or long-term noise impacts due to transportation and non-transportation noise included evaluations of roadway noise in existing and cumulative buildout conditions; landscape and building maintenance activities; mechanical equipment; solid waste collection; parking lots; commercial, office, and industrial activities; and residential, school, and recreation activities and events. The evaluation considered the impacts of these noise sources on sensitive receptors, including on residential uses. The analysis evaluated the potential for residential sites to be exposed to undue noise because of proximity to non-residential uses or other noise-generating sources, including an assessment of the cumulative noise generated by all of the City's higher-capacity roadways, and concluded that the City's General Plan includes extensive policies related to noise which are designed to reduce exposure to unacceptable noise volumes to the extent feasible. Nonetheless, the GP EIR concluded impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, since the City cannot demonstrate that adverse noise impacts will be absolutely prevented.

The Project is a reuse of an existing developed commercial site and is consistent with the land use designation. The site is not adjacent to any noise sensitive receptors (e.g., residential uses), however the Project is conditioned to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance. To the east of the site is N. Sunrise Avenue, a major arterial, and to the west of the site is Interstate 80. Both of these roadways are identified as transportation noise sources in the City’s General Plan Noise Element. According to the General Plan, the project site is within the 70 dB L_{dn} noise contour for existing and future roadways (City of Roseville General Plan 2035 Section IX, Figure IX-1 and Figure IX-2). The Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XIV. Population and Housing

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The General Plan analyzed in the GP EIR did not include changes to land use, the Sphere of Influence, or new growth. Furthermore, the majority of the vacant land adjacent to the City’s boundaries are within existing adopted Specific Plans within Placer County which contemplate urbanization and development. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded the General Plan did not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly, and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The Project site is located within the City’s Infill planning area. The site has a zoning designation of Community Commercial (CC) and a land use designation of Community Commercial (CC); no residential units are allocated to the Project site nor is there any existing housing on the property. The Project site is currently developed with a 145,743-square foot retail building, with associated parking, lighting, and landscaping. The Project is a reuse of the former building and will be occupied by EchoPark Automotive, a retail automotive sales and reconditioning use. Modifications will be made to the interior and exterior of the building and the Project also includes the construction of an approximate 2,000-square-foot car wash building. According to the General Plan, auto sales and repair is a primary use in the CC zone district. While not listed specifically as a primary use in the General Plan, the City’s Zoning Ordinance conditionally permits car wash facilities in the CC zone district. The General Plan relies on

the Zoning Ordinance to determine the appropriate location and design of car wash facilities through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process. The project includes a request for a CUP; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan. As such, the GP EIR analyses of potential population and housing impacts adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XV. Public Services

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a. Fire protection?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Police protection?	LTS	No	No	No
c. Schools?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Parks?	LTS	No	No	No
e. Other public facilities?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR evaluated police, fire, school, and park facility/service demands resulting from buildout of the General Plan. The analysis indicated that all of these services would require additional facilities and/or staff, but that each of the City’s adopted Specific Plans had anticipated and planned for these needs and had included the identification of sites and financing mechanisms. The EIRs for each Specific Plan had already evaluated the potential physical impacts of constructing the facilities. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded that the General Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered facilities, and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The City’s General Plan examined Citywide service needs based on land use designations, so any project consistent with existing land use designations would not negatively impact services. The proposed project remains consistent with the land use designation of the site, and therefore

this conclusion remains appropriate for this Project. Based on the foregoing, the GP EIR analyses of potential public service impacts adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project, and the Project does not result in new or substantial increases in significant effects.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XVI. Recreation

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR indicated that buildout of the General Plan would add residents to the City, and these residents would increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities, and would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, but that each of the City’s adopted Specific Plans had anticipated and planned for these needs and had included the identification of sites and financing mechanisms. The EIRs for each Specific Plan had already evaluated the potential physical impacts of constructing the facilities and the City’s policies ensure that adequate parkland acreage is developed and maintained. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded that the General Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision or maintenance of recreation facilities, and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The Project is within the scope of the above GP EIR analysis, and does not add any residential units. Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XVII. Transportation

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	SU	No	No	No
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The City of Roseville has adopted a Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Short-Range Transit Plan. The Project was reviewed for consistency with these documents. All facilities identified in these plans for this area are already installed, and the Project does not impact or conflict with these planning documents.

For checklist item b, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 establishes a detailed process for evaluating the significance of transportation impacts. In accordance with this section, the analysis must focus on the generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT); effects on automobile delay cannot be considered a significant impact. The GP EIR included a transportation analysis which estimated VMT using Roseville’s travel forecasting model, and reported VMT both in per capita (per resident) and per service population. The analysis also included the development of a VMT threshold of significance based on a reduction of 15% below baseline conditions. The City’s baseline VMT was found to be 15.1 VMT per resident and the resulting threshold was 12.8 VMT per resident. Per resident VMT includes VMT for trips produces by a home’s residents, such as to work school or to shop, and any trips where one end of the trip was at the home. The transportation analysis found that the City’s buildout VMT would be 15.5 VMT per resident in constrained conditions and 14.9 VMT per person in unconstrained conditions. Constrained conditions assumed a transportation network which only included future facilities with identified funding sources that were certain to be constructed by 2035, and was a worst-case evaluation provided to ensure the GP EIR did not underestimate any impacts. The unconstrained conditions included all facilities included in the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS project list. Pursuant to the tiering provisions of CEQA, future projects consistent with the General Plan will not require further VMT analysis. The Project is consistent with the General Plan given it is a site that is already developed and designated for commercial uses. Therefore, the Project is within the scope of the GP EIR analysis.

The Project has been reviewed by the City Fire Department staff to ensure the project does not result in inadequate emergency access, and has been found to be consistent with the City’s Design Standards. Furthermore, standard conditions of approval added to all City projects require compliance with Fire Codes and other design standards.

Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measure below was effectuated through inclusion in the City's 2035 General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Measures, but is included here for reference. No additional site-specific measures are required.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Proposed development projects that could have a potentially significant VMT impact shall consider reasonable and feasible project modifications and other measures during the project design and environmental review stage of project development that would reduce VMT effects in a manner consistent with state guidance on VMT reduction. The below list of potential measures is not intended to be exhaustive, and not all measures may be feasible, reasonable, or applicable to all projects. The purpose of this list is to identify options for future development proposals, not to constrain projects to this list, or to require that a project examine or include all measures from this list. Potential measures include:

- improve or increase access to transit;
- increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare;
- incorporate affordable housing into the project;
- incorporate neighborhood electric vehicle network;
- orient the project toward transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
- improve pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service;
- provide traffic calming;
- provide bicycle parking;
- unbundle parking costs;
- provide parking cash-out programs;
- implement roadway pricing;
- implement or provide access to a commute reduction program;

- provide car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs;
- provide transit passes;
- shifting single occupancy vehicle trips to carpooling or vanpooling, for example providing ride-matching services;
- providing telework options;
- providing incentives or subsidies that increase the use of modes other than single-occupancy vehicle;
- providing on-site amenities at places of work, such as priority parking for carpools and vanpools, secure bike parking, and showers and locker rooms;
- providing employee transportation coordinators at employment sites;
- providing a guaranteed ride home service to users of non-auto modes;
- locate the project near transit;
- increase project density;
- increase the mix of uses within the project or within the project’s surroundings;
- increase connectivity and/or intersection density on the project site; and/or
- deploy management strategies (e.g., pricing, vehicle occupancy requirements) on roadways or roadway lanes.

The City shall evaluate the feasibility of a local or regional VMT impact bank or exchange. Such an offset program, if determined feasible, would be administered by the City or a City-approved agency, and would offer demonstrated VMT reduction strategies through transportation demand management programs, impact fee programs, mitigation banks or exchange programs, in-lieu fee programs, or other land use project conditions that reduce VMT in a manner consistent with state guidance on VMT reduction. If, through on-site changes, a subject project cannot demonstrate consistency with state guidance on VMT reduction, the project can contribute on a pro-rata basis to a local or regional VMT reduction bank or exchange, as necessary, to reduce net VMT impacts.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?

<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>				
<p>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: For the GP EIR the City of Roseville contacted the Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52 consultation requirements, asking for a list of individuals that might have knowledge of the Planning Area. The City used this list to circulate a letter dated April 3, 2017 providing the opportunity to participate in consultation to ensure consideration of Tribal Cultural Resources in the context of local land use policy. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) responded to the request for consultation and provided information on the presence of tribal cultural resources as well as historic resources (cultural resources) within the Planning Area.

Impacts related to substantial adverse changes in the significance of a tribal cultural resources were found to be significant (GP EIR page 4.9-39) because the Planning Area is known to contain these resources and is sensitive for the presence of undiscovered or undocumented resources. In addition, some tribal cultural resources may also be cultural resources. The UAIC has indicated tribal cultural resources of significant value to the tribe are present in the Planning Area and could be impacted by grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities associated with buildout of the Planning Area. The General Plan included policy revisions to further strengthen protections, the GP EIR included mitigation measures to address these impacts, and the City adopted new Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation, all of which were developed within input from the UAIC. Nonetheless, impacts could still occur. After mitigation impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The analysis described above is based on the potential impacts of grading and general development within the Planning Area, and the Project neither changes the boundaries of the Planning Area nor the locations of potential grading and development within the Planning Area. Furthermore,

the Project site is already developed and will require minor grading within the existing developed parking lot to accommodate the proposed car wash building. Therefore, the GP EIR analyses of tribal cultural resources adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation consisted of the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9-4, previously stated in the Section V. Cultural Resources evaluation. No additional site-specific measures are required.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	SU	No	No	No
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	LTS	No	No	No
c. 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?	LTS	No	No	No
d. 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?	LTS	No	No	No
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR evaluation of utility services was based on full buildout of the General Plan, and capacity evaluation used the metrics appropriate to the impact area, as follows: for water, dwelling units or dwelling unit equivalents (edu); for wastewater, demand factors based on

acreage by land use type; and for waste, total population and employees. The GP EIR also evaluated the potential for facility expansions, including the planned expansion of the Dry Creek wastewater treatment plant; off-site construction of the Ophir water treatment plant by the Placer County Water Agency; a new planned substation and 60-kilovolt overhead transmission lines within the Creekview Specific Plan; and construction of water lines, sewer lines, electrical lines, and supporting facilities (e.g. pump stations). Except for the Ophir water treatment plant, expanded and new utilities and service systems would be within the Planning Area, and impacts associated with these facilities have already been identified and mitigated through Specific Plan EIRs. Therefore, with the exception of the Ophir plant, impacts were found to be less than significant. Construction of the Ophir plant was addressed in the Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plan and Pipeline EIR, discussed in the GP EIR, and it found that construction air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The GP EIR concluded that buildout of the General Plan would indirectly contribute to this significant and unavoidable impact. The Project is within the scope of the GP EIR analyses of capacity (see below) and would not require new facilities beyond those already identified.

Under buildout conditions, the City has a total water demand of 48,762 acre feet per year (afy), and has surplus water supply during normal years and during multiple-dry years 1 and 2. However, during a single-dry year there is an approximate 9,000-afy deficit and during multiple-dry year 3 there is an approximate 2,000-afy deficit. The City's conservation measures are sufficient during dry years to offset the deficit. Therefore, impacts were found to be less than significant.

The City's buildout demands on the wastewater system were reported in Table 4.12-7 of the GP EIR as 8.9 million gallons per day (mgd) of average dry weather flow, while the Pleasant Grove wastewater treatment plant's effective treatment capacity is 9.5 mgd, with plans to expand capacity to 12 mgd and the Dry Creek wastewater treatment plan has a permitted capacity of 18 mgd (note that treatment plants have service boundaries that include the City and other areas). The evaluation found there would be adequate capacity to serve full buildout of the City and impacts were found to be less than significant. The wastewater evaluation was based on the total acreage of citywide land uses, with approximately 13,000 acres of residential land use and 3,100 acres of commercial/office land use. The Project, which is consistent with the existing land use designation, would not require new or expanded water supply entitlements.

The City's additional waste demands were calculated based on the increase in population and employees between existing conditions and buildout conditions, and used CalRecycle solid waste disposal rates of 4.8 pounds per day (ppd) per resident and 8.2 ppd per employee. Based on these rates, buildout of the General Plan was found to generate an additional 428 ppd of solid waste. The EIR noted that this estimate was extremely conservative, as it does not account for recycling or waste diversion. The estimated increase in waste would be within the maximum daily throughput of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill, and therefore impacts were found to be less than significant. The Project is within the scope of the population and employees analyzed within the GP EIR, and is therefore within the scope of analysis of the waste evaluation; no changes or updates to this analysis are required.

In addition, future development accommodated under the General Plan would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, or local solid waste regulations or statutes, including the City's Construction and Demolition and Recycling Ordinance, 2016 CALGreen Code, and AB 1826 (mandatory commercial organics recycling). Furthermore, the City would continue to comply with AB 1601, which requires implementation of a commercial solid waste recycling program. Therefore, impacts related to compliance with regulations pertaining to solid waste were found to be less than significant. The Project has no effect on this analysis or conclusion.

The GP EIR analyses of utility services impacts adequately and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. Based on the foregoing, the Project would not result in any peculiar effects nor would it result in any new significant impacts for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XX. Wildfire

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	LTS	No	No	No
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	LTS	No	No	No
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	LTS	No	No	No
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	LTS	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: The GP EIR concluded that the Planning Area is not located in or near state responsibility areas or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The Planning Area is designated by CAL FIRE as a Local Responsibility Area, and there are no Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in or adjacent to the Planning Area. Therefore, the GP EIR concluded the wildfire hazard risk for the City is low. The City’s comprehensive planning has ensured that existing and planned fire stations are distributed through the Planning Area, and the City maintains and plans connected transportation networks consistent with the City’s Design and Construction Standards to ensure adequate emergency access and evacuation routes. The City maintains a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and Emergency Operations Plan, and the GP EIR found that the General Plan was consistent and supportive of these emergency planning documents. The proposed Project does not affect the foregoing analysis. There

are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

Mitigation Measures: None.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Prior EIR Determination	CEQA Section 15183(b) Criteria		
		Effect Peculiar to Project?	New Significant Effect?	New Information, More Severe Adverse Impact?
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	SU	No	No	No
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.)	SU	No	No	No
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	SU	No	No	No

No Impact; LTS = Less than significant; LTSM = Less than significant with mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable

Discussion: Chapter 5.0 of the GP EIR includes an evaluation of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, significant irreversible environmental changes, and a section on the significant and unavoidable impacts evaluated within the EIR. No new mitigation measures beyond those already identified in the topical sections of Chapter 4.0 were identified. As discussed in the sections above, the GP EIR found that General Plan buildout would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources. The

analysis found the following impacts would also be cumulatively considerable: greenhouse gas emissions; VMT; construction and operational air quality emissions; exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations (long-term); operational noise due to traffic and stationary sources; biological resources including special status plants, riparian habitat/sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and loss of habitat and special status wildlife species; both cultural and tribal cultural resources; indirect impacts due to construction of the Ophir water treatment plant; visual quality; and creation of substantial light and glare. These significant cumulative impacts have the potential to cause adverse impacts on human beings. As described in the foregoing analyses, the Project is within the scope of all impacts evaluated by the GP EIR and appropriately describe the potential impacts of the Project. There are no effects peculiar to the Project nor would the Project result in any new significant effects for this topic, and there is no new information indicating a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the GP EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

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 15183 concerning the decision that the Project does not need further environmental review can be made. As supported by substantial evidence within this Environmental Checklist, the Lead Agency makes the following findings:

The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.

There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GP EIR failed to analyze as significant effects.

There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GP EIR failed to evaluate.

There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GP EIR.

The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GP EIR.

Environmental Checklist Prepared by:

Kinarik Shallow

Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Development Services–Planning Division

Attachment:

1. Project Plans

NOTE: Attachment 1 (Project Plans) is not included with the checklist as it is already included as Exhibit B to the Planning Commission staff report.