
**ADDENDUM TO ROSEVILLE DIGITAL BILLBOARD PROJECT
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (SCH #2021110283, ADOPTED
ON January 19, 2022)**

Project Title/File Number:	DHCSP PCL DH-48 – Clear Channel Tree Permit, File # PL24-0890
Project Location:	260 S. Harding Bl.
Project Description:	The applicant requests a Tree Permit to allow the removal of two valley oak trees with a DBH of 16" and 12" respectively. The removal is requested as the trees are blocking the view of Clear Channel's billboard on site.
Project Applicant:	Lori Murphy, Davey Resource Group, Inc.
Property Owner:	Candice Stephenson Trustee, Et. Al.
Lead Agency Contact:	Shelby Maples, Associate Planner, (916)746-1347

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

Table of Contents

Project Description	3
Purpose and Scope of Addendum	3
Initial Study Checklist	
I. Aesthetics	7
II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources	8
III. Air Quality	9
IV. Biological Resources	10
V. Cultural Resources	13
VI. Energy	15
VII. Geology and Soils	15
VIII. Greenhouse Gases	17
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	18
X. Hydrology and Water Quality	20
XI. Land Use and Planning	22
XII. Mineral Resources	22
XIII. Noise	23
XIV. Population and Housing	24
XV. Public Services	25
XVI. Recreation	26
XVII. Transportation	27
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	28
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	31
XX. Wildfire	33
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance	34
Environmental Determination	36
Attachments	36

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location and Environmental Setting

The project site is located southwest of the intersection of I-80 and Douglas Boulevard, beyond the terminus of South Harding Boulevard, in the City of Roseville, CA. The project site, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 014-183-029, is vacant with the exception of a digital billboard, which was previously approved on January 19, 2022. The site has been subject to previous disturbance. The northern portion of the parcel has been used seasonally as a Christmas tree lot and the entire parcel has been used as a construction staging area by the Caltrans. Surrounding land uses include single-family residences to the west and southwest, a commercial area to the north, and I-80 and an associated on-ramp to the east and southeast. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Community Commercial (CC) and is zoned Planned Development (PD192).

Background

In 2022, The City of Roseville proposed the construction of the Roseville Digital Billboard Project (prior project) in the Infill Planning Area of the City of Roseville, California. The prior project approved the construction of a two-sided electronic billboard on a vacant parcel southwest of the intersection of Douglas Boulevard and I-80. Prior to 2011, billboard projects, such as the prior project, were not allowable in the City of Roseville. However, in 2011, the City adopted the Initial Study/Negative Declaration (2011 Sign Ordinance IS/ND) for the Sign Ordinance Amendment (Ordinance 4986), adding Section 17.17.035, Signs Permissible within City-Owned Property, to the Roseville Municipal Code (RMC), regarding signs on City-owned property. Consequently, the City considers the construction and maintenance of electronic billboards on City-owned property along I-80 and State Route 65 to be an allowable use. Per the Outdoor Advertising Act, enforced and administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), such electronic billboards shall only be allowed on commercial and industrially zoned property. An IS/MND for the Roseville Digital Billboard Project (SCH #2021110283) and was adopted on January 19, 2022.

Proposed Project

The project proposes the removal of two (2) protected Valley oak trees, including Tree #1 (16 inches DBH) and Tree #2 (12 inches DBH). According to the applicant, these trees obstruct views of the digital billboard and present an on-going maintenance problem that will result in the continual decline of the trees. Three (3) additional trees are proposed for removal, including a 5.5-inch DBH Valley oak which does not meet the criteria for protection under the Tree Preservation Ordinance, a 10.5-inch DBH catalpa (*Catalpa bignoides*), and a eucalyptus tree on a neighboring property.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

Basis for Addendum

This Addendum has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. As explained earlier, an addendum is an appropriate subsequent review document EIR when some changes to a project are necessary, but those changes do not create new or increased significant environmental impacts that warrant major revisions to the previously certified Final EIR (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a), 15164(a); see *Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 946; *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego* (2018) 28 Cal.App.5th 656, 668). Also, an addendum is appropriate when circumstances surrounding a project have not substantially changed and when no new information of substantial importance has been uncovered that indicates the project would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of the previously identified significant impacts; see discussion immediately below (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a), 15164(a)).

Notably, in assessing whether a proposed project change is eligible for an addendum, public agencies may account for mitigation measures to which an applicant has agreed (see, e.g., *River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Bd.* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168 [“even a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact does not require ... the preparation of an SEIR if mitigation measures are adopted which reduce the impact to a level of insignificance”]; *Citizens Against Airport Pollution v. City of San Jose* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 788, 809-811 [“[t]o offset the loss of four acres of burrowing owl habitat, the eight[h] addendum includes a number of mitigation measures”]; and *Snarled Traffic Obstructs Progress v. City and County of San Francisco* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 793, 802 [discusses mitigation required in connection with addendum]). The addition of new mitigation measures triggers the need for a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR only in two circumstances. Under the first, measures “previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1)(3)(C)). Under the second circumstance, measures “considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure” (*id.* at Section 15162(a)(1)(3)(D)). Under both circumstances, an applicant’s agreement to the mitigation measures in question preserves the project’s eligibility for an addendum. Where there are new or revised regulatory standards, new technology and modern data, and/or updated best practices, mitigation measures may be updated in an addendum from those approved in the certified Final EIR and approved mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) without triggering the need for a subsequent EIR (see, e.g., *Mani Brothers Real Estate Group v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1403 [“[m]itigation measures adopted when a project is approved may be changed or deleted if the agency states a legitimate reason for making the changes and the reason is supported by substantial evidence”]; *Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342, 359).

Substantial evidence presented in this Addendum demonstrates that the Project, described above and analyzed below, does not create any new significant impacts or increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts in the SVSP EIR (inclusive of the 2012 MND). Nor are there any new circumstances or new information that would create such impacts or require more robust analysis (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)). All of the impacts of the Project were examined in the applicable prior CEQA documents. Therefore, an addendum is the appropriate CEQA document, and a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not warranted (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e)).

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was adopted on January 19, 2022 for the Roseville Digital Billboard Project (SCH # 2021110283). The project included the installation, operation, and maintenance of a two-sided electronic billboard, approximately 35 to 50 feet tall, with sign faces approximately 14 feet by 48 feet, at the eastern portion of the project site. The original document is available for review on the City of Roseville website, under Environmental Documents & Public Notices:

<https://www.roseville.ca.us/cms/One.aspx?portalId=7964922&pageId=8774505>

The IS/MND did not identify any significant and unavoidable impacts, and impacts related to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources were found to be less than significant with mitigation. The analyses below rely on the IS/MND analysis with minor supplements or technical updates where appropriate. As tree removal was not considered as part of the original environmental analysis, the Addendum has been updated to reflect the removal of two valley oak trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ADDENDUM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e. changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean there are no potential impacts relative to the

environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed in prior environmental documents.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Where Impact was Analyzed

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

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project will result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review documents and related approvals, or will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any new Circumstances Involving New Impacts?

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

Any new Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

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

Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts

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

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

Discussion

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

Mitigation Measures

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

CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Page 3-4	No	No	No	None
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Page 3-4	No	No	No	None
c. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Page 3-4	No	No	No	None
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Page 3-4	No	No	No	None

Discussion: The prior IS/MND explains that the City's Planning area does not contain scenic vistas or any designated or eligible State scenic highways. The site is also located within an urbanized area of the City of Roseville. The IS/MND determined that the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or the surroundings, and would have a less than significant impact.

The proposed project involves the removal of two (2) native oak trees which are partially obscured by a soundwall along Interstate 80. The visual character of the site was previously evaluated by the prior IS/MND. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation required for this project.

II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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?	Page 3-7	No	No	No	None
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Page 3-7	No	No	No	None
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))?	Page 3-7	No	No	No	None
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Page 3-7	No	No	No	None
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?	Page 3-7	No	No	No	None
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND states that the project site is located on property identified by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as "Urban and Built-Up Land". The parcel does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The IS/MND determines that the project does not have any impact to agricultural and forestry resources.</p>					

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required for this project.

III. Air Quality

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Pages 3-9 through 3-14	No	No	No	None
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?	Pages 3-9 through 3-14	No	No	No	None
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Pages 3-9 through 3-14	No	No	No	None
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Pages 3-9 through 3-14	No	No	No	None

Discussion: Air Quality was adequately addressed in the prior IS/MND, which includes a full explanation of the various pollutants and applicable significance thresholds. The analysis concludes that the prior project would not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of pollutants, including localized carbon monoxide or toxic air contaminants, during construction or operation. The prior project was found to have a less than significant impact related to exposure to sensitive receptors as well as for generation of odors.

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.

IV. Biological Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None
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?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None
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?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None
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?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Pages 3-15, 16	No	No	No	None
--	----------------	----	----	----	------

Discussion: The previous environmental document describes the natural environment of the site, which primarily consists of dirt and ruderal grasses that have been subject to previous disturbance. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, including wetlands, located on the site, nor does the site support wildlife movement corridors. There are no streams or other waterways that could be used by migratory fish or as a wildlife corridor for other species on or adjacent to the site. The site is not located within the Placer County Conservation Plan area and therefore would not interfere with implementation.

Ground disturbance was minimal for the construction of the billboard, and at the time the removal of the oak trees on the site was not contemplated as a part of the project. The prior project completed a search of the Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) to identify which, if any, special status species may exist in the general project region. The report determined that, given the heavily disturbed condition of the site, it was highly unlikely that the development of the billboard would impact any special status species. The IS/MND identified Swainson's hawk, purple martin, golden eagle, pallid bat, and white-tailed kite could be potentially impacted due to the removal of trees. However, no mitigation was added as this was not a part of the project at the time.

The prior IS/MND concludes that, given the highly disturbed nature of the project site and surrounding area, it is unlikely that the project would result in impacts to biological resources. Out of an abundance of caution, due to the proposed removal of the trees, mitigation is required to conduct nesting surveys if work is to be completed during the breeding season for raptor species. With mitigation, impacts will be less than significant.

With mitigation, the current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: MM BIO-1: Avoid Nesting Sites

To ensure that fully protected bird and raptor species are not injured or disturbed by construction in the vicinity of nesting habitat, the project applicant shall implement the following measures:

- a) Conduct raptor nest surveys prior to removal of the trees during the breeding season (spring and early summer). If an active nest is located on one of the trees planned for removal, removal will be postponed to the non-breeding season. When feasible, all tree removal shall occur between August 30th and February 15th to avoid the breeding season of any raptor species that could be using the area, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of an upcoming construction area.
- b) For Swainson's hawk, if avoidance of tree removal outside the breeding season is not feasible, and a nest is present, the applicants would be required to obtain a 2081 permit from CDFG to mitigate for potential "take" under CESA. If no nesting is occurring, a take permit would not be required.
- c) If a legally protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 30th or until the adults and young of the year are no longer dependent on the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist.

V. Cultural Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource pursuant to in Section 15064.5?	Page 3-17	No	No	No	CUL-1 and CUL-2
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Page 3-17	No	No	No	CUL-1 and CUL-2
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Page 3-17	No	No	No	CUL-1 and CUL-2

Discussion: The prior IS/MND includes an explanation of historical and archaeological resources, and were adequately addressed in the prior document. A record search for the site and the surrounding 0.25 mile radius was conducted by staff at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System on September 30, 2021, which did not yield any results on the project site. Similarly, a search of the Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands file did not indicate the presence of any known cultural resources on the project site. There are no known historical or archaeological resources that have been identified on site.

However, as the possibility exists that ground disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown subsurface resources, it was determined that mitigation would be appropriate to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures, CUL-1 and CUL-2, remain applicable to the current project.

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Implement Measures to Protect Previously Unidentified Cultural Resources

The City shall ensure that construction specifications include the following information in the grading notes:

- Construction shall stop if potential cultural resources are encountered. It is possible that previous activities have obscured surface evidence of cultural resources. If signs of an archeological site, such as any unusual amounts of stone, bone, or shell, are uncovered during grading

or other construction activities, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the find and the City of Roseville will be notified. A qualified archeologist shall be consulted for an onsite evaluation. If the site appears to be eligible for listing in State or federal registers, additional mitigation, such as further testing for evaluation or data recovery, may be necessary.

- In the event resources are discovered, the City shall retain a qualified archaeologist to assess the find and to determine whether the resource requires further study. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and evaluated for significance under all applicable regulatory criteria.
- All work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and, if the find is determined to be an important cultural resource, the City shall make available contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow recovery of an archaeological sample or to implement an avoidance measure. Construction work may continue on other parts of the project while archaeological mitigation takes place.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Implement Measures if Construction Activities

Inadvertently Discover or Disturb Human Remains

The City shall ensure that construction specifications include the following in the grading notes:

- If human remains are discovered during any phase of construction, including disarticulated or cremated remains, the construction contractor shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the remains and notify the City of Roseville.

In accordance with California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the following steps have been completed:

- The County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
- If the remains are determined by the County Coroner to be Native American, NAHC will be notified within 24 hours, and the treatment and disposition of the remains will comply with NAHC guidelines.
- It is further recommended that a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), if any, identified by NAHC. As necessary and appropriate, a professional archaeologist may provide technical assistance to the MLD, including excavation and removal of the human remains.

VI. Energy

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Page 3-20	No	No	No	N/A
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy inefficiency?	Page 3-20	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND includes a discussion on the potential energy impacts for the project during the construction and operational phases. The project was constructed consistent with the California Building code, including the CAL Green Code, and the evaluation determined that there were no significant impacts associated with the Project. The current project includes the removal of trees, which will require the temporary use of construction equipment for the removal. However, there is no long term energy usage associated with the current request.</p> <p>The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

VII. Geology and Soils

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
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.)	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
iv) Landslides?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A

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?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Pages 3-23 through 3-26	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately evaluates the geology of the project site, explaining the geological make-up of the project location and the suitability of the soil for construction. The current project includes the removal of trees on the heavily disturbed project site, and does not change the prior analysis.</p> <p>The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

VIII. Greenhouse Gases

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Pages 3-26, 27	No	No	No	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Pages 3-26, 27	No	No	No	
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project. As the proposed project includes only minor vegetation removal, the current project is consistent with the previous evaluation. The project will have a less than significant impact on GHG emissions.</p>					

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Pages 3-28 through 3-30	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-28 through 3-30	No	No	No	N/A
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Pages 3-28 through 3-30	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-28 through 3-30	No	No	No	N/A

<p>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?</p>	<p>Pages 3-28 through 3-30</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>	<p>Pages 3-28 through 3-30</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>g) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</p>	<p>Pages 3-28 through 3-30</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses hazards and hazardous materials associated with the development of the proposed project, and found that the prior project will largely have no impact. Due the use of heavy equipment during the construction phase, which could contain fuels and oils, it was found that the project could involve small quantities of potentially toxic substances. However, compliance with California Health Safety Codes as well as local City ordinances regulating the handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials lead to a conclusion that impacts would be less than significant.

Similarly, the current project may involve the use of heavy equipment for the removal of the trees. The proposed project is consistent with the prior analysis. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
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:	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site;	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
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	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A

d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
e) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A
f) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiches zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Pages 3-31 through 3-33	No	No	No	N/A

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential for the project to result in hydrologic impacts. The development includes minimal ground disturbance and is not located in a flood zone that would result in additional hazards. The current project involves the removal of trees, and is substantially consistent with the prior project. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.

XI. Land Use and Planning

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Physically divide an established community?	Page 3-34	No	No	No	N/A
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Page 3-34	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses impacts to land use and zoning. The proposed project involves the removal of trees, which will be completed consistent with the provisions of the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

XII. Mineral Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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?	Page 3-36	No	No	No	N/A

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?	Page 3-36	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses mineral resources associated with the site. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

XIII. Noise

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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?	Pages 3-37 through 3-41	No	No	No	None
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration of ground borne noise levels?	Pages 3-37 through 3-41	No	No	No	None
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 working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Pages 3-37 through 3-41	No	No	No	None

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential noise impacts of the project, and concludes that impacts are less than significant. While the current project may include temporary noise sources caused by heavy equipment for the tree removal, there are no long term noise sources that will increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. The primary noise source on the project site is vehicle traffic on major roadways in the vicinity, including I-80 and Douglas Bl.

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.

XIV. Population and Housing

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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)?	Page 3-42	No	No	No	N/A
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Page 3-42	No	No	No	N/A

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses population and housing, and the current project is consistent with that evaluation. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.

XV. Public Services

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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 governmental 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 the public services:	Page 3-43				N/A
a) Fire protection?	Page 3-43	No	No	No	N/A
b) Police protection?	Page 3-43	No	No	No	N/A
c) Schools?	Page 3-43	No	No	No	N/A
d) Parks?	Page 3-43	No	No	No	N/A
e) Other public facilities?	Page 3-43	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential impacts to public services associated with this project. The current request includes the removal of trees on a private parcel, and will not require public services in the long term. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

XVI. Recreation

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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?	Page 3-45	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Page 3-45	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: Consistent with the prior project and the prior IS/MND, the current request will not impact recreational resources. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

XVII. Transportation

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Page 3-46	No	No	No	N/A
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Page 3-46	No	No	No	N/A
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature(s) (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Page 3-46	No	No	No	N/A
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Page 3-46	No	No	No	N/A
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential impacts to transportation for the Project. As with the prior project, traffic associated with the project would be minor during the construction phase – in this case, equipment for tree removal. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this project.</p>					

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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:					TCR-1
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)?		No	No	No	TCR-1
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.		No	No	No	TCR-1

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses tribal cultural resources. In addition to archeological resources, tribal cultural resources are also given particular treatment. Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as either 1) a site, feature, place, geographically-defined cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register or Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources or as 2) a resource determined by the lead agency, supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe. Although the prior IS/MND did not anticipate any impacts due to the analysis included in the document, mitigation measures were added in the event of unanticipated discovery of tribal cultural resources. The same mitigation measures will apply to the current project.

The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Implement Measures to Protect Unanticipated Discoveries.

If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin, or tribal cultural resources, are discovered during construction, all work shall halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery, and the Construction Manager shall immediately notify the City of Roseville Development Services Director by phone. The Construction Manager shall also immediately coordinate with the monitoring archeologist or project archaeologist and tribal monitor (if present), or, in the absence of either, contact consulting tribe(s) and a qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology and subject to approval by the City, to evaluate the significance of the find and develop appropriate management recommendations, in coordination with the consulting tribe(s) if the find is a tribal cultural resource.

All management recommendations shall be provided to the City in writing for the City's review and approval. If recommended by the qualified professional archeologist, and consulting tribe(s), and approved by the City, this may include modification of the no-work radius.

The professional archaeologist must make a determination, based on professional judgement and supported by substantial evidence, within one business day of being notified, as to whether or not the find represents a cultural or tribal cultural resource or has the potential to be a cultural or tribal cultural resource. The consulting tribe shall also be provided the opportunity to determine, within one business day of being notified, whether or not the find represents a tribal cultural resource or has the potential to be a tribal cultural resource. The subsequent actions will be determined by the type of discovery, as described below. These include: 1) a work pause that, upon further investigation, is not actually a discovery and the work pause was simply needed in order to allow for closer examination of soil (a "false alarm"); 2) a work pause and subsequent action for discoveries that are clearly not related to tribal resources, such as can and bottle dumps, artifacts of European origin, and remnants of built environment features; and 3) a work pause and subsequent action for discoveries that are likely related to tribal resources, such as midden soil, bedrock mortars, groundstone, or other similar expressions.

Whenever there is question as to whether or not the discovery represents a tribal resource, culturally affiliated tribes shall be consulted in making the determination. Whenever a tribal monitor is present, the monitor shall be consulted.

The following processes shall apply, depending on the nature of the find, subject to the review and approval of the City:

- **Response to False Alarms:** If the professional archaeologist determine that the find is negative for any cultural indicators and tribal representatives have not indicated the find is a tribal cultural resource, then work may resume immediately upon notice to proceed from the City's representative.. No further notifications or archaeological consultation is necessary if it is determined that the discovery is not a cultural or tribal cultural resource of any kind. The professional archaeologist shall provide written documentation of this finding to the City, which shall include as an attachment any written documentation provided by tribal representatives or monitors.
- **Response to Non-Tribal Discoveries:** If a tribal monitor is not present at the time of discovery and a professional archaeologist determines that the find represents a non-tribal cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, the City shall be notified immediately, to consult on a finding of eligibility and implementation of appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. The professional archaeologist shall provide a photograph of the find and a written description to the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville will notify any [tribe(s)] who, in writing, requested notice of unanticipated discovery of non-tribal resources. Notice shall include the photograph and description of the find, and a tribal representative shall have the opportunity to determine whether or not the find represents a tribal cultural resource. If a response is not received within 24 hours of notification (none of which time period may fall on weekends or City holidays), the City will deem this portion of the measure completed in good faith as long as the notification was made and documented. If requested by a [tribe(s)], the City may extend this timeframe, which shall be documented in writing (electronic communication may be used to satisfy this measure). If a notified tribe responds within 24 hours to indicate that the find represents a tribal cultural resource, then the Response to Tribal Discoveries portion of this measure applies. If the tribe does not respond or concurs that the discovery is non-tribal, work shall not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the site either: 1) is not a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.
- **Response to Tribal Discoveries:** If the find represents a tribal or potentially tribal cultural resource that does not include human remains, the consulting tribe(s) and City shall be notified. The City will consult with the tribe(s) on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be either a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, or a Tribal Cultural Resource, as defined in Section 21074 of the Public Resources Code. Preservation in place is the preferred treatment, if feasible. Work shall not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the site either: 1) is not a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines; or 2) not a Tribal Cultural Resource, as defined in Section 21074 of the Public Resources Code; or 3) that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.
- **Response to Human Remains:** If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, the construction supervisor or on-site archaeologist and (if present) tribal monitor shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641) and shall notify the City and Placer County Coroner (per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 shall be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify

the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§ 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. Public Resources Code § 5097.94 provides structure for mediation through the NAHC if necessary. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§ 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code).

If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains in a respectful manner where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work shall not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) 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?	Pages 3-52, 53	No	No	No	N/A
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	Pages 3-52, 53	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-52, 53	No	No	No	N/A

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?	Pages 3-52, 53	No	No	No	N/A
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Pages 3-52, 53	No	No	No	N/A

Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the utilities that would be required to serve the electronic billboard project. The current project includes the removal of trees, and no changes to the utilities are required. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.

Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.

XX. Wildfire

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Pages 3-54, 55	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-54, 55	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Pages 3-54, 55	No	No	No	N/A

<p>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?</p>	<p>Pages 3-54, 55</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND adequately addresses the potential for wildfire-related impacts. The project site is not located in a State Responsibility Area, and is not considered susceptible to downstream flooding, landslide, and the Roseville Fire Department is responsible for fire protection services. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None required for this Project.</p>					

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	<p>Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.</p>	<p>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</p>	<p>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</p>	<p>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</p>	<p>Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.</p>
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?</p>	<p>Page 3-56</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>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.)</p>	<p>Page 3-56</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p>Page 3-56</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Discussion: The prior IS/MND discusses the cumulatively considerable impacts of the project, as well as whether or not the project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment. The prior IS/MND finds that with mitigation to accommodate the potential discovery of cultural or tribal cultural resources, impacts would be less than significant. The project is consistent with the land use and zoning designations, and development of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts in the City of Roseville. The project, including the current request for tree removal, would comply with all applicable General Plan policies, Roseville Municipal Code standards, and all other applicable local and state regulations. The impacts are less than significant. The current project would not result in any new or substantially more significant impacts requiring the preparation of a subsequent document pursuant to CEQA Section 15162.</p>					

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 15162 concerning the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or negative declaration and the findings of CEQA Section 15164 concerning the decision to prepare an Addendum can be made. As supported by substantial evidence within the Addendum to the ROSEVILLE DIGITAL BILLBOARD PROJECT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (SCH #2021110283, ADOPTED ON January 19, 2022), the Lead Agency makes the following findings:

[X] No substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

[X] There is no new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of due diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted.

[X] Only minor technical changes or additions are necessary in order to deem the adopted environmental document adequate.

Addendum Prepared by:

Shelby Maples

Shelby Maples, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Development Services–Planning Division

Attachments:

1. ROSEVILLE DIGITAL BILLBOARD PROJECT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (SCH #2021110283, ADOPTED ON January 19, 2022)