

**Volume 1**

---

**PREFACE**

---

**CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION**

---

1.1	Project Background	1-1
1.2	Purpose and Intended Use of the EIR	1-3
1.3	Type of EIR	1-5
1.4	Prior Approvals/Relationship to the WRSP	1-6
1.5	Continuing Relevance of the WRSP EIR for the CSP	1-11
1.6	Relationship to the SACOG preferred Blueprint Scenario	1-13
1.7	Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies	1-13
1.8	Scope of the EIR	1-14
1.9	Environmental Review Process	1-16
1.10	Document Organization	1-18

**CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

2.1	Project Location and Summary	2-1
2.2	Project Area Characteristics	2-3
2.3	Project Objectives	2-8
2.4	Proposed Project	2-11
2.5	Circulation	2-21
2.6	Public Facilities and Services	2-32
2.7	Storm Water Drainage and Flood Control	2-45
2.8	Off-Site Improvements	2-54
2.9	Resource Management	2-57
2.10	Implementation	2-58
2.11	Project Disclosures	2-65
2.12	Required Permits and Approvals	2-67

---

**CHAPTER 3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3-1**


---

**CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**


---

<b>4.1</b>	<b>Land Use and Agricultural Resources</b>	
4.1.1	Introduction	4.1-1
4.1.2	Environmental Setting	4.1-2
4.1.3	Regulatory Setting	4.1-13
4.1.4	Impacts	4.1-39
4.1.5	Mitigation Measures	4.1-67
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Population and Housing</b>	
4.2.1	Introduction	4.2-1
4.2.2	Environmental Setting	4.2-2
4.2.3	Regulatory Setting	4.2-8
4.2.4	Impacts	4.2-10
4.2.5	Mitigation Measures	4.2-19
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>	
4.3.1	Introduction	4.3-1
4.3.2	Environmental Setting	4.3-3
4.3.3	Regulatory Setting	4.3-26
4.3.4	Impacts	4.3-39
4.3.5	Mitigation Measures	4.3-169
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Air Quality</b>	
4.4.1	Introduction	4.4-1
4.4.2	Environmental Setting	4.4-1
4.4.3	Regulatory Setting	4.4-15
4.4.4	Impacts	4.4-25
4.4.5	Mitigation Measures	4.4-44

<b>4.5</b>	<b>Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	
4.5.1	Introduction	4.5-1
4.5.2	Environmental Setting	4.5-1
4.5.3	Regulatory Setting	4.5-4
4.5.4	Impacts	4.5-31
4.5.5	Mitigation Measures	4.5-42
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Noise</b>	
4.6.1	Introduction	4.6-1
4.6.2	Environmental Setting	4.6-1
4.6.3	Regulatory Setting	4.6-12
4.6.4	Impacts	4.6-16
4.6.5	Mitigation Measures	4.6-41

## Volume 2

<b>4.7</b>	<b>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</b>	
4.7.1	Introduction	4.7-1
4.7.2	Environmental Setting	4.7-2
4.7.3	Regulatory Setting	4.7-12
4.7.4	Impacts	4.7-18
4.7.5	Mitigation Measures	4.7-24
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Vegetation and Wildlife</b>	
4.8.1	Introduction	4.8-1
4.8.2	Environmental Setting	4.8-2
4.8.3	Regulatory Setting	4.8-24
4.8.4	Impacts	4.8-38
4.8.5	Mitigation Measures	4.8-78

<b>4.9</b>	<b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>	
4.9.1	Introduction	4.9-1
4.9.2	Environmental Setting	4.9-1
4.9.3	Regulatory Setting	4.9-5
4.9.4	Impacts	4.9-12
4.9.5	Mitigation Measures	4.9-20
<b>4.10</b>	<b>Hazardous Materials and Public Safety</b>	
4.10.1	Introduction	4.10-1
4.10.2	Environmental Setting	4.10-2
4.10.3	Regulatory Setting	4.10-5
4.10.4	Impacts	4.10-19
4.10.5	Mitigation Measures	4.10-31
<b>4.11</b>	<b>Public Services</b>	
<b>4.11.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	4.11-1
<b>4.11.2</b>	<b>Environmental Settings</b>	4.11-1
<b>4.11.3</b>	<b>Law Enforcement</b>	
4.11.3-1	Environmental Setting	4.11-3
4.11.3-2	Regulatory Setting	4.11-4
4.11.3-3	Impacts	4.11-5
<b>4.11.4</b>	<b>Fire Protection</b>	
4.11.4-1	Environmental Setting	4.11-7
4.11.4-2	Regulatory Setting	4.11-9
4.11.4-3	Impacts	4.11-10
<b>4.11.5</b>	<b>Schools</b>	
4.11.5-1	Environmental Setting	4.11-13
4.11.5-2	Regulatory Setting	4.11-16
4.11.5-3	Impacts	4.11-20

<b>4.11.6</b>	<b>Libraries</b>		
4.11.6-1	Environmental Setting		4.11-23
4.11.6-2	Regulatory Setting		4.11-24
4.11.6-3	Impacts		4.11-24
<b>4.11.7</b>	<b>Parks and Recreation</b>		
4.11.7-1	Environmental Setting		4.11-26
4.11.7-2	Regulatory Setting		4.11-28
4.11.7-3	Impacts		4.11-30
<b>4.11.8</b>	<b>Public Services Mitigation Measures</b>		
4.11.8-1	Law Enforcement		4.11-32
4.11.8-2	Fire Protection		4.11-33
4.11.8-3	Schools		4.11-33
4.11.8-4	Libraries		4.11-34
4.11.8-5	Parks and Recreation		4.11-34
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Public Utilities</b>		
<b>4.12.1</b>	<b>Water</b>		
4.12.1.1	Introduction		4.12.1-1
4.12.1.2	Environmental Setting		4.12.1-2
4.12.1.3	Regulatory Setting		4.12.1-26
4.12.1.4	Impacts		4.12.1-43
4.12.1.5	Mitigation Measures		4.12.1-77
<b>4.12.2</b>	<b>Recycled Water</b>		
4.12.2.1	Introduction		4.12.2-1
4.12.2.2	Environmental Setting		4.12.2-2
4.12.2.3	Regulatory Setting		4.12.2-6
4.12.2.4	Impacts		4.12.2-9
4.12.2.5	Mitigation Measures		4.12.2-16

<b>4.12.3</b>	<b>Wastewater</b>	
4.12.3.1	Introduction	4.12.3-1
4.12.3.2	Environmental Setting	4.12.3-2
4.12.3.3	Regulatory Setting	4.12.3-8
4.12.3.4	Impacts	4.12.3-12
4.12.3.5	Mitigation Measures	4.12.3-26
<b>4.12.4</b>	<b>Solid Waste</b>	
4.12.4.1	Introduction	4.12.4-1
4.12.4.2	Environmental Setting	4.12.4-1
4.12.4.3	Regulatory Setting	4.12.4-5
4.12.4.4	Impacts	4.12.4-9
4.12.4.5	Mitigation Measures	4.12.4-17
<b>4.12.5</b>	<b>Electricity, Natural Gas and Telecommunication Services</b>	
4.12.5.1	Introduction	4.12.5-1
4.12.5.2	Environmental Setting	4.12.5-1
4.12.5.3	Regulatory Setting	4.12.5-3
4.12.5.4	Impacts	4.12.5-15
4.12.5.5	Mitigation Measures	4.12.5-16
<b>4.13</b>	<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	
4.13.1	Introduction	4.13-1
4.13.2	Environmental Setting	4.13-1
4.13.3	Regulatory Setting	4.13-10
4.13.4	Impacts	4.13-18
4.13.5	Mitigation Measures	4.13-43
<b>4.14</b>	<b>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>	
4.14.1	Introduction	4.14-1
4.14.2	Environmental Setting	4.14-2

4.14.3	Regulatory Setting	4.14-4
4.14.4	Impacts	4.14-12
4.14.5	Mitigation Measures	4.14-21

---

## **CHAPTER 5 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS**

---

### **5.0 CEQA Considerations**

5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Significant Environmental Effects	5-1
5.3	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-1
5.4	Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects	5-3
5.5	Growth Inducing Impacts	5-4
5.6	Impacts of Induced Growth	5-8

### **5.7 Cumulative Impacts**

5.7.1	Introduction	5-9
5.7.2	Development Considered in the Cumulative Analysis	5-10
5.7.3	Cumulative Impact Assessment	5-16

---

## **CHAPTER 6 ALTERNATIVES**

---

### **6.1 Alternatives**

6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Alternatives Analyzed	6-1
6.3	Alternatives Considered and Dismissed	6-3
6.4	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	6-6
6.5	Alternative 2: Reduced Development	6-8
6.6	Alternative 3: Reduced Development Footprint	6-26
6.7	Alternative 4: Wetlands Avoidance	6-40

---

**CHAPTER 7 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

---

**7.1 Planning Considerations**

7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Policy Setting	7-3
7.3	Policy Analysis	7-6

**CHAPTER 8 ACRONYMS 8-1**

---

**CHAPTER 9 REPORT PREPARATION 9-1**

---

**Volume 3**

---

**APPENDICIES A - G**

**Volume 4**

---

**APPENDICIES H**

**Volume 5**

---

**APPENDICIES I - S**

**Volume 6**

---

**CHAPTER 10 TEXT CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR 10-1**

---

**CHAPTER 11 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 11-1**

---

---

**FIGURES**


---

**Chapter 1 Figures**


---

1-1	Offsite Improvement Area	1-2
1-2	Vicinity Map	1-4

**Chapter 2 Figures**


---

2-1	Regional Development	2-2
2-2	Existing Conditions	2-5
2-3	Property Ownership	2-6
2-4	Land Use Plan	2-14
2-5	School, Parks, and Open Space	2-19
2-6	Circulation Plan	2-23
2-7	Arterial Street Sections	2-26
2-8	Bikeway Networks	2-31
2-9	Water Distribution System	2-35
2-10	Wastewater Collection	2-38
2-11	Recycled Water Distribution	2-40
2-12	Electric Facilities	2-42
2-13	Proposed Bypass Channel	2-49
2-14	Stormwater Conveyance	2-51
2-15	Off-Site Improvements	2-56
2-16	Phasing Plan	2-60

**Chapter 4 Figures**


---

4.1-1	Vicinity Map	4.1-4
4.1-2	Regional Land use Map	4.1-8
4.1-3	Creekview Specific Plan Land Use Map	4.1-10
4.1-4	Proposed Placer Parkway Alignment	4.1-48
4.2-1	Affordable Housing Locations	4.2-15
4.3-1	Signalized Intersections	4.3-9

4.3-2	Transit Routes	4.3-12
4.3-3	Existing Bicycle Facilities	4.3-14
4.3-4	Existing Daily Traffic Volumes	4.3-16
4.3-5	Proposed Transit Facilities	4.3-35
4.3-6	Roadway Network	4.3-45
4.3-7	Trip Distribution	4.3-48
4.3-8	Existing and Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes	4.3-49
4.3-9	2025 Daily Traffic Volumes with the Project	4.3-109
4.4-1	Proximity to Industrial uses	4.4-39
4.6-1	Airport 60dB CNEL Noise Contours	4.6-9
4.6-2	Noise Measurement Locations	4.6-11
4.6-3	Roseville Energy Park Noise Contours	4.6-24
4.7-1	Soils Map	4.7-4
4.8-1	Habitat Types	4.8-5
4.8-2	Wetland Delineation	4.8-7
4.8-3	Potential Offsite Wetland Mitigation Areas	4.8-46
4.8-4	Special Status Species	4.8-50
4.8-5	Swainson’s Hawk Nest Radius	4.8-59
4.12.1-1	Existing and Future Well Site Locations	4.12.1-19
4.12.1-2	CSP Normal/Wet Year Water Supply Strategy	4.12.1-50
4.12.1-3	Surface Water Supply Shortfall During Historic American River Hydrologic Dry and Driest Year Records	4.12.1-55
4.12.1-4	Dry and Driest Year Supply Scenario Staged Water Conservation	4.12.1-57
4.12.1-5	Dry and Driest Year Supply Scenario 20% Water Conservation	4.12.1-58
4.12.1-6	Surface Water Delivery Pattern – OCAP	4.12.1-61
4.12.2-1	Location of Tank, Pump Station, and Well Facility	4.12.2-14
4.12.3-1	2005 Service Area Boundary	4.12.3-4
4.12.3-2	Ultimate SPWA Service Area Boundary	4.12.3-6
4.12.5-1	Electric Facilities	4.12.5-9

4.13-1	Pleasant Grove Creek Watershed	4.13-2
4.13-2	FEMA Floodplain Map	4.13-5
4.13-3	Base Flood Elevations	4.13-6
4.13-4	Historic Floodplain Map	4.13-7
4.13-5	PGWWTP Outfall Location	4.13-9
4.13-6	Pre and Post Hydrograph	4.13-24
4.13-7	In-stream 100-year Detention	4.13-26
4.13-8	Post Project 100-year Floodplain	4.13-34
4.14-1	Photograph North View at Future Blue Oaks / Westbrook Boulevards	4.14-6
4.14-2	Photograph of Existing Phillips Road and Future Blue Oaks Boulevard	4.14-7
4.14-3	Photograph of Western Edge of CSP toward Reason Farms Panhandle	4.14-8
4.14-4	Photograph of West Side of CSP toward Reason Farms	4.14-9
4.14-5	Photograph of Pleasant Grove Creek through Creekview	4.14-10

**Chapter 6 Figures**

6-1	Alternative 2, Reduced Footprint/Same Density Site Plan	6-9
6-3	Alternative 3, Reduced Footprint/Same Density Site Plan	6-28
6-4	Alternative 4, Wetland Avoidance Site Plan	6-42

**TABLES****Chapter 2**

2-1	Creekview Specific Plan Land Use Summary	2-13
2-2	Preliminary Grading Summary	2-64
2-3	Proposed amendments to General Plan Noise Table IX-3	2-65

**Chapter 3 Tables**

3-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3-1
-----	--	-----

**Chapter 4 Tables**

4.1-1	Proposed Creekview Specific Plan Land Use	4.1-40
4.1-2	Urban Reserve Land Use Assumptions	4.1-43
4.2-1	Placer County Population and Growth Rates	4.2-2
4.2-2	Summary of Roseville Housing Units (October 2010)	4.2-5
4.2-3	2009 Median Household Income by Family Size for the Sacramento Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	4.2-6
4.2-4	Adjusted Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Roseville 2008-2013	4.2-7
4.2-5	Affordable Units Proposed in the CVSP	4.2-14
4.2-6	Affordable Housing by Parcel	4.2-16
4.3-1	Level of Service Definitions at Signalized Intersections	4.3-7
4.3-2	LOS Definitions on Roadway Segments	4.3-8
4.3-3	LOS at Roseville Signalized Intersections – Existing Conditions	4.3-19
4.3-4	Roadway Segment LOS Thresholds	4.3-43
4.3-5	Trip Generation Rates	4.3-52
4.3-6	LOS at Roseville Signalized Intersections Existing Plus Project Conditions – AM Peak Hour	4.3-55
4.3-7	LOS at Roseville Signalized Intersections Existing Plus Project Conditions – PM Peak Hour	4.3-63
4.3-8	Roseville Intersections with Degraded LOS – Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-73
4.3-9	Recommended Intersection Mitigation Measures – Existing Plus Proposed Project	4.3-73
4.3-10	LOS at Rocklin Roadway Segments – Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-78
4.3-11	LOS at Lincoln Roadway Segments – Existing Plus	4.3-79

	Proposed Project Scenario	
4.3-12	LOS at Placer County Intersection - Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-82
4.3-13	LOS at Placer County Roadway Segments Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-85
4.3-14	LOS at Sacramento County Intersections Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-87
4.3-15	LOS at Sacramento County Roadway Segments Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-89
4.3-16	LOS at Sutter County Intersections Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-92
4.3-17	LOS at Sutter County Roadway Segment Existing Plus Proposed project Scenario	4.3-95
4.3-18	LOS at Signalized Highway Ramp Intersections Existing Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-96
4.3-19	Average Daily Traffic Volumes and LOS on State Highways Existing Plus Proposed Project	4.3-100
4.3-20	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better 2025 CIP Existing Scenario	4.3-107
4.3-21	LOS at Roseville Intersections 2025 CIP Plus Project conditions – AM Peak Hour	4.3-111
4.3-22	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at "C" or Better 2025 CIP Plus Project Scenario – AM Peak Hour	4.3-122
4.3-23	Roseville Intersections with Degraded LOS 2025 CIP Plus Project Conditions – PM Peak Hour	4.3-133
4.3-24	Recommended Intersection Mitigation Measures 2025 CIP and Proposed Project	4.3-134
4.3-25	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better 2025 CIP and Proposed Project – AM Peak Hour	4.3-138
4.3-26	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better 2025 CIP and Proposed Project – PM Peak Hour	4.3-139
4.3-27	LOS at Placer County Intersections 2025 CIP and Proposed Scenario	4.3-143
4.3-28	LOS at Placer County Roadway Segments 2025 CIP and Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-145

4.3-29	LOS at Sacramento County Intersections 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-147
4.3-30	LOS at Sacramento County Roadway Segments 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-149
4.3-31	LOS at Sutter County Roadway Intersections 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-151
4.3-32	LOS at Sutter County Roadway Segment 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-153
4.3-33	LOS at Rocklin Roadway Segments 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-154
4.3-34	LOS at Lincoln Roadway Segments - 2025 CIP Plus Proposed Project Scenario	4.3-156
4.3-35	LOS Signalized Highway Ramp Intersections - 2025 CIP Plus Project Scenario	4.3-158
4.3-36	Average Daily Traffic Volume and LOS on State Highways – 2025 CIP Plus Project Scenario	4.3-161
4.4-1	California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards	4.4-5
4.4-2	Sacramento Air Basin State and National Ambient Air Quality Attainment Status	4.4-6
4.4-3	Ozone Monitoring Results North Sunrise Monitoring Station	4.4-7
4.4-4	Carbon Monoxide Monitoring Results North Highlands-Blackfoot Way Monitoring Station	4.4-8
4.4-5	Particulate Matter Monitoring Results at the Roseville North Sunrise Monitoring Station	4.4-9
4.4-6	2025 Buildout and construction Emissions (Unmitigated pounds per day)	4.4-29
4.4-7	2025 Buildout Constructions Emissions by Phase (Mitigated pounds per day)	4.4-30
4.4-8	Criteria Pollutant Emissions at Buildout (2025) Compared to Thresholds (pounds per day)	4.4-33
4.4-9	Criteria Pollutant Emissions at Buildout (2025) Compared to Thresholds (pounds per day with mitigation)	4.4-34
4.4-10	2025 Modeled Carbon Monoxide Levels	4.4-36

4.5-1	Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Unmitigated, Metric Tons Per Year)	4.5-36
4.6-1	Sound Levels of Typical Noise Sources and Noise Environments	4.6-5
4.6-2	Existing Traffic Noise Levels	4.6-7
4.6-3	Existing Noise Monitoring Results	4.6-10
4.6-4	Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Transportation Noise Sources	4.6-14
4.6-5	Performance Standards for Non-Transportation Noise Sources	4.6-15
4.6-6	Subjective Reaction to Changes in Noise Levels of Similar Sources	4.6-16
4.6-7	Construction Equipment Noise	4.6-19
4.6-8	Existing Plus Project Transportation Noise Impacts	4.6-30
4.6-9	2025 Predicted Project Traffic Noise Levels	4.6-32
4.6-10	Traffic Noise Levels at Proposed Residential Uses	4.6-35
4.6-11	Proposed Revisions to: Table IX-3 of the Roseville General Plan Noise Element Performance Standards for Non-Transportation Noise Sources	4.6-38
4.7-1	Site Soil Characteristics	4.7-9
4.8-1	Biological Communities present within the Creekview Specific Plan	4.8-3
4.8-2	Special Status Species That Could Occur in the Project Area	4.8-11
4.8-3	Potential Habitat Impacts	4.8-40
4.8-4	Total Direct Impact to Waters of the U.S. in the CVSP Project Area	4.8-43
4.8-5	Swainson’s Hawk Mitigation Ratios	4.8-92
4.11.1	Existing Public Service Providers	4.11-2
4.11.2	Roseville Joint Union High School District High School Capacities and Enrollment – 2010	4.11-14
4.11.3	Roseville City School District School Capacity	4.11-15
4.11.4	Student Generation Rates by School District	4.11-20
4.11.5	Existing Parks and Open Space	4.11-27

4.12.1-1	City of Roseville Surface Water Contracts	4.12.1-4
4.12.1-2	Existing Municipal Well Facility Information	4.12.1-18
4.12.1-3	Water Demand Factors	4.12.1-23
4.12.1-4	Creekview Specific Plan Water Demands	4.12.1-48
4.12.1-5	Urban Reserve Water Demands	4.12.1-51
4.12.1-6	Water Forum Agreement Impacts on Historic American River Hydrologic Dry and Driest Year Records	4.12.1-54
4.12.1-7	Maximum Day Peaking Factors	4.12.1-68
4.12.1-8	Groundwater Supply Needs and Buildout Conditions- Water Forum Dry Year Scenario	4.12.1-74
4.12.1-9	Groundwater Supply Needs and Buildout Conditions USBR OCAP Dry Year Scenario	4.12.1-75
4.12.2-1	Urban Growth Areas Recycled Water Customers and Demands	4.12.2-5
4.12.2-2	Irrigation Demands Versus Recycled Water Supply	4.12.2-12
4.12.3-1	Average Dry Weather Unit Generation Rates	4.12.3-13
4.12.3-2	CSP Average Dry Weather Flow Summary	4.12.3-17
4.12.3-3	PGWWTP Buildout Flows with CSP (ADWF)	4.12.3-18
4.12.3-4	PGWWTP Buildout Flows with CSP and Urban Reserve (ADWF)	4.12.3-20
4.12.3-5	Water Quality and Aquatic Resource Impact Summary on Pleasant Grove Creek for Discharges from the PGWWTP UP To 29.5 MGD	4.12.3-25
4.12.4-1	2008 Solid Waste Generation, Detail (TONS)	4.12.4-4
4.12.4-2	Solid Waste Generation, Disposal and Diversion Rates	4.12.4-4
4.12.5-1	Estimated Electrical Demand at Buildout	4.12.5-7
4.12.5-2	Estimated Natural Gas Peak Demand at Buildout	4.12.5-11
4.13-1	Pleasant Grove Creek Water Quality Data	4.13-8
4.13-2	100-year (and 10 year) Peak Flow Comparison	4.13-23
4.13-3	Water Surface Comparison (Pre and Post Project)	4.13-32
4.13-4	100-Year Peak Flow Comparison	4.13-33

**Chapter 5 Tables**

5-1	Employment Growth	5-7
5.7-1	CSP Plus Urban Reserve Buildout	5-11
5.7-2	Regional Cumulative Development	5-12
5.7-3	Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impacts	5-16
5.7-4	Roseville Intersections 2025 Plus Project Cumulative Partial Placer Parkway Conditions – AM Peak Hour	5-20
5.7-5	Percentage of Roseville Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Project Conditions – AM Peak Hour LOS C or Better	5-30
5.7-6	Roseville Intersections Significant Impacts Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Project Scenario	5-32
5.7-7	Roseville 2025 and Cumulative Conditions Plus Partial Placer Parkway Conditions – PM Peak Hour	5-33
5.7-8	Percentage of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS “C” or Better Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Project Scenario – PM Peak Hour	5-44
5.7-9	LOS at Rocklin Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-45
5.7-10	LOS Lincoln SOI Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway	5-46
5.7-11	LOS at Placer County Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-47
5.7-12	LOS at Placer County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-48
5.7-13	LOS at Sacramento County Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-50
5.7-14	LOS at Sacramento County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-51
5.7-15	LOS at Sutter County Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-52

5.7-16	LOS at Sutter County Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-53
5.7-17	LOS at Sutter County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-54
5.7-18	LOS at Signalized State Highway Ramp Intersections Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project Scenario	5-56
5.7-19	Average Daily Traffic Volumes and LOS on State Highways Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Plus Proposed Project	5-59
5.7-20	LOS at Roseville Intersections Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway conditions – AM Peak Hour	5-69
5.7-21	LOS at Roseville Intersections Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway Conditions – PM Peak Hour	5-79
5.7-22	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS “C” or Better Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway – AM Peak Hour	5-80
5.7-23	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS “C” or Better Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – PM Peak Hour	5-81
5.7-24	Roseville Intersections with Degraded LOS 2025 Cumulative Plus Proposed Project Scenario Without Placer Parkway	5-83
5.7-25	LOS Rocklin Segments	5-85
5.7-26	LOS Lincoln SOI Segments	5-86
5.7-27	Recommended Intersection Mitigation Measures 2025 Cumulative Plus Proposed Project Scenario Without Placer Parkway	5-87
5.7-28	LOS at Placer County Intersections Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-88
5.7-29	LOS at Placer County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-90
5.7-30	LOS at Sacramento County Intersections Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-91
5.7-31	LOS at Sacramento County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-92

5.7-32	LOS at Sutter County Intersections Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-93
5.7-33	LOS at Sutter County Roadway Segments Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-94
5.7-34	LOS at Signalized Highway Ramp Intersections Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-97
5.7-35	Average Daily Traffic Volumes and LOS on State Highways Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway	5-99
5.7-36	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better Cumulative Plus Project With and Without Placer Parkway – AM Peak Hour	5-99
5.7-37	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better Cumulative Plus Project With and Without Placer Parkway – PM Peak Hour	5-101
5.7-38	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better Super Cumulative Plus Project Scenario – AM Peak Hour	5-102
5.7-40	Number of Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "C" or Better Super-Cumulative Plus Project Scenario – AM Peak Hour	5-102
5.7-40	Roseville Intersections Operating at LOS "D" or Worse Super-Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour	5-104
5.7-41	Modeled Carbon Monoxide Levels for 2035 Cumulative conditions	5-109
5.7-42	2025 Predicted Traffic Noise Levels	5-111
5.7-43	Cumulative Water Demand	5-121
5.7-44	Summary of Roseville Electric Resources for Calendar Year 2008	5-147

**Chapter 6 Tables**

6-1	Alternative 2, Reduced Footprint/Same Density Land Use Summary	6-10
6-2	Intersections with Significant LOS Changes, Alternative 2	6-13

6-3	Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Emissions Generated by the Alternative 2 (Unmitigated, Pounds per Day)	6-15
6-4	Alternative 2, Operations Green House Gas Emissions Unmitigated Metric Tons per Year	6-16
6-5	Water Supply Project vs. Alternative 2	6-21
6-6	Wastewater Flows Project vs. Alternative 2	6-22
6-7	Solid Waste Generation Project vs. Alternative 2	6-23
6-8	Alternative 3, High Density/ Compact Development Land Use	6-27
6-9	Intersections with Significant LOS Changes Alternative 3	6-31
6-10	Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Emissions Generated by Alternative 3, (Unmitigated Pounds per Day)	6-32
6-11	Alternative 3, Operations Greenhouse Gas Emissions Unmitigated Metric Tons per Year	6-33
6-12	Water Supply Project vs. Alternative 3 (Acre Feet per Year)	6-37
6-13	Wastewater Flows, Project vs. Alternative 3 (In Million Gallons per Day)	6-38
6-14	Solid Waste Generation Project vs. Alternative 3	6-39
6-15	Wetland Avoidance Land Use Summary	6-41

**APPENDICES****Volume 3****Appendices: A - G**

Appendix A	Notice of Preparation
Appendix B	Comments Received on the Notice of Preparation
Appendix C	GMVC Recommendations
Appendix D	Traffic Analysis
Appendix E	Traffic Data
Appendix F	Air Quality Report

Appendix G Sanitary Sewer Master Plan

---

**Volume 4**

**Appendices: H**

Appendix H

Water Appendices:

Appendix H-1 ASR Notice of Preparation

Appendix H-2 Water Supply Assessment

Attachment 1: TM-1 Unit Water Demand Factor Verification and Water Demand Evaluation and Update

Attachment 2: CSP Potable Water Master Plan

Attachment 3: CSP Water Conservation Plan

Attachment 4: CSP Recycled Water Master Plan

Attachment 5: American River Hydrologic Record

Attachment 6: City of Roseville Water Supply Contracts

Attachment 7: Groundwater Impact Analysis for Proposed Reason Farms Land Retirement Plan

Appendix H-3 Water Forum Agreement

Appendix H-4 RBI Technical Memo (Effects of Changed Water Management Operations on Fisheries and Water Quality Impacts Previously Disclosed in the Water Forum Agreement EIR)

Appendix H-5 WFA EIR Mitigation Measures

**Volume 5**

---

**Appendices: I - S**

Appendix I	Merritt Smith Technical Memo (Cumulative Analysis of UGA Impacts on Water Quality and Aquatic Resources in Pleasant Grove Creek)
Appendix J	Wastewater Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measures
Appendix K	Noise Analysis
Appendix L	Policy Analyses
Appendix M	Master Drainage Study Creekview Bypass Channel
Appendix N	City of Roseville General Plan Policies
Appendix O	Placer County General Plan Policies
Appendix P	City/USFWS MOU
Appendix Q	Dry Utilities Report
Appendix R	Biological Resource Assessment
Appendix S	Vernal Pool Recovery Plan Information

## **3.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

**TABLE 3-1  
Summary of Impacts and  
Mitigation Measures  
is found on the following pages.**

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Land Use and Agricultural Resources</b>				
4.1-1	<b>Conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations.</b> Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would require the adoption of new zoning districts and a General Plan Amendment..	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.1-2	<b>Potential incompatibility of internal land uses.</b> The proposed project will include residential, commercial and parks land uses. Design of the individual projects consistent with the City's Communitywide Design Guidelines would reduce the potential for conflicts.	CSP	LTS for potential sensitive use adjacencies S for temporary construction impacts	MM 4.6-1 Construction Noise Measures; MM 4.6-2 Commercial Noise Controls.	LTS
		UR	LTS for potential sensitive use adjacencies S for temporary construction impacts	MM 4.6-1 Construction Noise Measures; MM 4.6-2 Commercial Noise Controls.	LTS
4.1-3	<b>Potential incompatibility with existing agricultural and other land uses in the Urban Reserve parcel, the County, and the City of Roseville.</b> At the time the Urban Reserve builds out, surrounding uses including the CSP could be subject to construction noise, and dust.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.5-2 Construction Noise Policies; WMM 4.4-3 Reduction of Construction Emissions	LTS
4.1-4	<b>Potential incompatibility from overflight operations at McClellan Airport.</b> The project is located approximately 7 miles north of McClellan Airfield. It will be subject to overflights.	CSP	S	None identified	SU
		UR	S	None identified	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.1-5	<b>Conversion of agricultural land to developed uses.</b> The project would convert grazing land to urban uses. However, no prime land or soils that support agricultural uses are present on the project site.	CSP	S	MM 4.1-1 Agricultural Compensation; MM 4.8-4 Off-site and On-site Preservation of Grassland Habitat	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.1-2 Agricultural Conversion Policies	LTS
4.1-6	<b>Consistency with habitat conservation plans</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Population and Housing</b>				
4.2-1	<b>Significant change in the jobs/housing balance.</b> The proposed project would increase the number of jobs and housing units in the City, but would not create a jobs/housing imbalance.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.2-2	<b>Provision of Affordable Housing.</b> The proposed project would provide approximately 2,011 new residential units, a substantial portion of which will be medium and high-density that would provide affordable housing options. Further the project will comply with the City's 10 percent affordability standards.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.2-1 Affordable Housing Program	LTS
4.2-3	<b>Displacement of existing housing.</b> The proposed project would not displace existing housing to households of low or moderate income.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	NI	None required	NI
4.2-4	<b>Inducement of substantial population growth.</b> The proposed project would	CSP	S	None available	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	result in substantial population growth.	UR	S	None available	SU
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>				
<b>4.3-1</b>	<b>Increased volumes on City of Roseville existing conditions.</b> . With the introduction of traffic from the proposed project, a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic volumes would increase at several signalized study intersections in the Plan area, resulting in an LOS of D or worse at various intersections.	CSP	S	MM 4.3-1 Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.3-1 Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP	LTS
<b>4.3-2</b>	<b>Increased demand for transit.</b> Unacceptable AM and PM. Peak Hour LOS at Signalized Intersections under Cumulative (2025) Plus Project Conditions. The proposed project would increase traffic conditions in the City of Roseville.	CSP	PS	MM 4.3-2 Pay Fair Share Toward Transit Improvements	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.3-9 Transit Services Policies	LTS
<b>4.3-3</b>	<b>Impacts to bicycle facilities.</b> Implementation of the proposed land uses in the Plan area would increase the demand for bicycle facilities in the plan area.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.3-7 Provide Appropriate Bicycle Network With Future Specific Plan Submittal	LTS
<b>4.3-4</b>	<b>Increased volumes on City of Rocklin roadways existing conditions.</b> Implementation of the proposed land uses in the Plan area would increase traffic in the city of Rocklin.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.3-5</b>	<b>Increased volumes on City of Lincoln roadways</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	<b>existing conditions.</b> Implementation of the proposed land uses in the Plan area would increase traffic in the city of Lincoln.	UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-6	<b>Increased traffic volumes on Placer County intersections under existing conditions.</b>	CSP	S	MM-4.3-3, Placer County: Contribute Fair Share Costs to Roadways	SU
		UR	S	WMM-4.3-4: Construct Identified Improvements on Placer County Roadways	SU
4.3-7	<b>Increase traffic volumes on Placer County roadway segments under existing conditions.</b> ➤ Walerga Road south of Baseline (LOS D to LOS E)	CSP	S	MM-4.3-3 Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share Cost of Improvements; MM 4.3-4 Pay Fair Share of Walerga Road Improvements	SU
		UR	S	WMM-4.3-4 Construct Identified Improvements; MM-4.3-3 Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share Cost of Improvements; 4.3-4 Pay Fair Share of Walerga Road Improvements	SU
4.3-8	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing Sacramento County intersections.</b>	CSP	LTS	None Required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None Required	LTS
4.3-9	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing Sacramento County roadway segments.</b>  • Walerga Road south of Elverta	CSP	S	MM 4.3-5 Contribute Fair Share Costs to Sacramento County Facilities	SU
		UR	S	MM 4.3-5 Contribute Fair Share Costs to Sacramento Facilities	SU
4.3-10	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing Sutter County intersections.</b>  • Pleasant Grove S. and Riego Road (LOS E to F)	CSP	S	MM 4.3-6 Contribute Fair Share Costs to Sutter County Facilities.	SU
		UR	S	MM 4.3-6 Pay Fair Share Costs to Sutter County Facilities	SU
4.3-11	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing Sutter County roadways.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.3-12	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing State interchanges.</b> One interchange would degrade with traffic from the project under existing conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ I-80 Eastbound off at Taylor Road/Eureka Boulevard</li> </ul>	CSP	LTS	MM 4.3-7: Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Interchanges	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.3-7: Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Interchanges	LTS
4.3-13	<b>Increased traffic volumes on existing State highways.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Douglas Boulevard to Eureka Road – 0.1 percent increase in ADT</li> <li>• Eureka to Talyor Road-0.6 percent increase in ADT</li> <li>• Taylor Road to 65-0.6 percent increase in ADT</li> <li>• I-80 to Galleria Boulevard-1.7 percent increase in ADT</li> <li>• Galleria Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard-2.8 percent increase in ADT</li> <li>• Pleasant Grove to Blue Oaks Bouelvard-3.7 percent increase in ADT</li> </ul>	CSP	S	MM 4.3-8: Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Roadway Segments	SU
		UR	S	MM 4.3-8: Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Roadway Segments	SU
4.3-14	<b>Increased traffic on City of Roseville under 2025 conditions.</b> Under the year 2025 scenario the project would cause level of service impacts to intersections.  <b>A.M Peak Hour:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cirby/Foothills</li> </ul>	CSP	S	MM 4.3-1 Pay Fair Share Improvements to the CIP.	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.3-1 Traffic Improvement Policies.	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	<b>PM Peak Hour:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue Oaks &amp; Diamond Creek</li> <li>Pleasant Grove &amp; Fiddymment</li> </ul>				
4.3-15	<b>Consistency of project with City's policy of 70 percent of intersections operating at LOS C or better.</b> The project would meet the City's 70 percent LOS policy under year 2025 conditions.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-16	<b>Increased demand of transit service 2025</b>	CSP	PS	MM 4.3-2 Pay Fair Share Toward Transit Improvements	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.3-9 Transit Services Policies	LTS
4.3-17	<b>Increased demand on bicycle facilities 2025</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.3-7 Provide Appropriate Bicycle Network With Future Specific Plan Submittal	LTS
4.3-18	<b>Increased traffic on Placer County intersections under 2025 conditions.</b> Traffic from the project would cause and impact intersections. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fiddymment/Athens</li> </ul>	CSP	S	MM 4.3-3, Placer County Roadways: Pay Fair Share of Improvements	SU
		UR	PS	WMM 4.3-4 Construct Identified Improvements on Placer County Roadways; MM 4.3-3, Placer County Roadways: Pay Fair Share of Improvements	SU
4.3-19	<b>Increased traffic on Placer County segments under 2025 conditions.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-20	<b>Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadway intersections under 2025 conditions.</b> None of the Sacramento	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	County intersections experience a significant level of service degradation with the addition of the proposed project.	UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-21	Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadway segments under 2025 conditions.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-22	Increased traffic on Sutter County Intersections	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-23	Increased traffic on Sutter County roadway segments under 2025 conditions.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-24	Increased traffic on City of Rocklin roadway segments under 2025 conditions. No impacts would occur with project traffic in 2025.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-25	Increased traffic on City of Lincoln roadway segments under 2025 conditions.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-26	Increased traffic volumes on existing State interchanges.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.3-27	Increased traffic volumes on existing State highways.	CSP	S	MM 4.3-8, Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Roadway Segments	SU
		UR	S	MM 4.3-8, Contribute Fair Share Costs to State Roadway Segments	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.3-28	Short and long-term construction impacts.	CSP	S	MM 4.1-2 Agricultural Compensation, MM 4.13-2 Stormwater Management Development Standards, MM 4.8-1 No Net Loss of Wetlands, MM 4.8-7 Offsite Surveys, MM 4.8-6 Habitat Restoration, MM 4.9-1 Cease Work and consult with Qualified Archaeologist, MM 4.4-1 Dust and Construction Control Measures, MM 4.10-1 Identify Potential Hazardous Materials; MM 4.6-1 Construction Noise Reduction, MM 4.9-2 Cease Work Until Review conducted by Qualified Paleontologist and Recommendations Implemented, MM 4.9-3 conduct Appropriate Off-site Studies	SU
		UR	S	MM 4.1-2 Agricultural compensation, WMM 4.7-2 Wetland Protection Policies, WMM 4.7-15 Conduct Appropriate Offsite Surveys, WMM 4.8-2 Include policies and Conditions that Require Proper Handling of Archaeological Resources; WMM 4.8-13 Conduct Appropriate Surveys, MM 4.13-3 Storm Water Quality Policies, WMM 4.4-3 Reduction of Construction Emissions; WMM 4.5-2 Construction Noise Policies; WMM 4.9-2 Soil Contamination Policies	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Air Quality</b>				
<b>4.4-1</b>	<b>Generate short-term construction-related emissions.</b> Construction activities in Plan area would exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 lbs/day. Thus, project-generated, construction-related emissions of ROG, NOx and PM10 could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, especially considering the nonattainment status of Western Placer County.	CSP	S	MM 4.4-1 Dust and Construction Control Measures; 4.4-2 A-H Short-term Construction Related Impacts	Short Term SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.4-2 Dust and Construction Control Policies and WMM 4.4-3 Reduction of Construction Emissions	Short Term SU
<b>4.4-2</b>	<b>Generate long-term operation-related (regional) emissions.</b> Project-generated operation-related emissions of ROG and NOx would exceed PCAPCD's recommended cumulative summertime threshold of 10 lb. Project-generated, operation-related emissions could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts.	CSP	S	WMM 4.4-4 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions; WMM 4.4-6 Operational Emissions Policies	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.4-4 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions WMM 4.4-6 Operational Emissions Policies	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.4-3	<b>Generate Carbon Monoxide Emissions at Local Intersections.</b> Project-generated, long-term operation-related (local) mobile-source emissions of CO would not violate or contribute substantially to a violation of the CAAQS or NAAQS, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.4-4	<b>Exposure to toxic air contaminants.</b>	CSP	PS	WMM 4.4-7 (a) Risk Assessment and Site Specific Measures; MM 4.4-3 Screening Health Risks	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.4-7 (a) Risk Assessment and Site Specific Measures	LTS
4.4-5	<b>Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.4-6	<b>Consistency with plans and policies</b>	CSP	S	WMM 4.4-4 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions; MM 4.4-1 Dust and Construction Control Measures	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.4-6 Operational Emissions Policies	SU
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>				
4.5-1	<b>Increased short-term construction-related and long-term operational greenhouse gas emissions.</b>	CSP	PS	MM 4.5-1 Air Quality Measures and MM 4.5-2 Additional Measures to Reduce GHG Emissions	SU
		UR	PS	WMM 4.4-4 Reduction of Construction Emissions; WMM 4.4-5 Operational Emissions Policies, MM 4.5-1 Air Quality Measures; and MM 4.5-2 Additional Measures to Reduce GHG Emissions	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.5-2	<b>Impacts on the proposed project related to global climate change.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Noise</b>				
4.6-1	Implementation of the proposed project would result in short-term construction activities associated with individual development projects in the Plan area. These construction activities could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards and/or result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.	CSP	S	MM 4.6-1 Construction Noise Reduction	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.5-2 Construction Noise Policies and MM 4.6-1 Construction Noise Reduction	SU
4.6-2	<b>Commercial noise sources.</b> Implementation of the project would result in increases in stationary source noise associated with the proposed commercial land uses. These stationary noise sources could potentially exceed the City's noise standards (hourly and maximum) and result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.	CSP	S	MM 4.6-2 Commercial Noise Controls	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.5-4 Commercial Noise Policies	LTS
4.6-3	<b>Compatibility with Roseville Energy Park</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.6-4	<b>Noise from school related activities</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.6-5	<b>Noise related to park uses.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.6-6	<b>Existing plus project increase in traffic noise.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.5-8 On-Site Traffic Noise Attenuation and WMM 4.5-10 On-Site Traffic Noise Policies	LTS
4.6-7	<b>Year 2025 plus project increase in traffic noise outside the plan area.</b> The plan would increase traffic on local roadways that would increase traffic generated noise levels in the vicinity of the project area.	CSP	S	MM 4.6- 3: Traffic Noise Attenuation	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.5-8 Onsite Traffic Noise Attenuation and WMM 4.5-10 Onsite Traffic Noise Policies	SU
4.6-8	<b>Traffic noise impacts at future noise sensitive uses within the project area.</b>	CSP	S	MM 4.6-3 Traffic noise attenuation	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.5-8 Onsite Traffic Noise Attenuation and WMM 4.5-10 Onsite Traffic noise Policies	LTS
4.6-9	<b>Consistency with the General Plan Noise Element for non-transportation noise sources and General Plan Amendment.</b> Land use is proposed within the 45-50 dBA contour of the REP.	CSP	S	Proposed General Plan Amendment Table 4.6-11	LTS
		UR	S	Proposed General Plan Amendment Table 4.6-11	LTS
4.6-10	<b>McClellan overflight noise.</b> Aircraft at McClellan fly under 3,000 feet over the project area. Single event noise could cause a nuisance to future residents.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Geology, Soils and Seismicity</b>				
4.7-1	<b>Soil erosion from grading activities.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.7-2	<b>Development of structures on expansive soils or on soils with other limitations.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.7-3	<b>The loss of topsoil due to conversion of agricultural land to urban uses.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.7-4	<b>Exposure to people and structures to seismic hazards.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Vegetation and Wildlife</b>				
4.8-1	<b>Loss of federally protected wetlands and “other waters” of the United States.</b> The project would result in the loss of approximately wetlands and waters of the United States.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-1 (a) Ensure No Net Loss of Wetlands; MM 4.8-1 (b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-2 Wetland Protection Policies	LTS
4.8-2	<b>Loss of Federally Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans and their habitat.</b> Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp are present within the project site. Construction activities could impact this species.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-1 (a) No Net Loss of Wetlands; MM 4.8-1 (b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan, MM 4.8-4 Offsite Preservation of Grasslands.	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-2 Wetland Protection Policies, and WMM 4.7-3 Vernal Pool Crustacean Policies	LTS
4.8-3	<b>Loss of rare plant populations.</b> The project area contains vernal pool habitat. Vernal pools represent potential habitat for dwarf dowingia, legenera, and other special status plants. Dwarf dowingia was identified onsite.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-1 No Net Loss of Wetlands; MM 4.8-1 (b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-2 Wetland Protection Policies	LTS
4.8-4	<b>Loss or degradation of habitat for Western Spadefoot.</b> No spadefoots were identified during surveys, however, the potential exists for spadefoots to occur on site.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-1 (a) No Net Loss of Wetlands; MM 4.8-2 Relocate Western Spadefoots; MM 4.8-4 Off-site and On-site Preservation of Grassland Habitat	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-5 Spadefoot Protection Policies and WMM 4.7-2 Relocate Western Spadefoots	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.8-5	<b>Loss or degradation of habitat for Red-Legged Frog, California Tiger Salamander, and Western Pond Turtle.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would include enhancement of the aquatic and riparian woodland habitats within and along Curry Creek, providing a beneficial long-term impact. None of the species are known to occur in the project area.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.8-6	<b>Disruption of Swainson's Hawk, Burrowing Owl, and other legally protected raptors.</b> Construction activities have the potential to damage or disturb Swainson's Hawk, burrowing owls and other raptors through construction activities.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-3 Avoid Nesting Sites and MM 4.8-4 Preservation of Offsite Grasslands	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-7 Nest Protection Policies	LTS
4.8-7	<b>Loss of Grassland Habitat.</b> The project would result in the conversion of grassland habitat to urban uses.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-4 On-site and Off-site Preservation of Grassland Habitat	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-9 Swainson's Hawk Habitat Policies	LTS
4.8-8	<b>Substantial interference with the movement of resident and migratory wildlife species.</b> Proposed project features, grading, and construction activities may overlap or may occur within the drip line of protected trees. Depending upon the configuration of the approved site plans and the final extent of grading, the project may result in potentially significant impacts to protected trees.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-5 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies and MM 4.14-3 Avoid Light-Spillover	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-11 Stream Protection Policies; MM 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spill Over; WMM 4.7-13 (d) Riparian Habitat Policies	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.8-9	<b>Loss of Oak trees of greater than 6 inches in diameter.</b> A total of six oak trees occur in the project area. Compliance with the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance will ensure that oak trees are protected.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.8-10	<b>Loss of riparian habitat.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in development that would occur within the riparian habitat and stream corridors along Pleasant Grove Creek and University Creek. Some portions of the project are adjacent to the stream corridor. This proximity presents the possibility of direct and secondary effects to the habitat due to removal of riparian habitat and/or spillover of human intrusion.	CSP	S	MM 4.8-5 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies and MM 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spillover	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.8-5 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies and MM 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spillover	LTS
4.8-11	<b>Loss of biological resources due to construction of off-site infrastructure.</b>	CSP	S	MM 4.8-7 Off-site Surveys; MM 4.8-1 (a) No Net Loss; MM 4.8-1 (b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan; MM 4.8-2 Relocate Western Spadefoots; MM 4.8-3 Avoid Nesting Sites; MM 4.8-4 Off-site and On-site Preservation of Grassland Habitat; MM 4.8-5 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies; MM 4.8-6 Habitat Restoration/Onsite Preservation	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.7-2 Wetland Protection Policies; WMM 4.7-3 Vernal Pool Crustacean Policies; WMM 4.7-5 Spadefoot Protection Policies; WMM 4.7-9 Swainson's hawk policies; WMM 4.7-11 Stream Protection Policies; WMM 4.7-15 Conduct appropriate Surveys	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.8-12	<b>Potential impacts to the California Black Rail.</b> There are no known populations of Black Rail within the project area.	CSP	LTS	None Required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.8-13	<b>Potential impacts to bats.</b> Suitable habitat for bats is not present in the project site.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.8-14	<b>Potential impacts to Giant Garter Snake.</b> No known populations of Garter Snake are present within the project area. Further, the Curry Creek drainage will be set aside in permanent open space.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	NI	None required	NI
4.8-15	<b>Impacts to fish habitat.</b> Anadromous fish species, such as Central Valley spring and winter-run Chinook salmon and steelhead are not anticipated to occur within Curry Creek.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	NI	None required	NI
4.8-16	<b>Impacts to beavers.</b> Numerous populations of beavers are known to occur throughout the Roseville area. They are not federally or state protected. While beavers may be present in Pleasant Grove Creek, construction of the project would be considered a less than significant impact.	CSP	NI	None required	NI
		UR	NI	None required	NI
4.8-17	<b>Conflict with the provision of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural conservation community plan or other approved conservation plan.</b> The County is currently preparing the Placer County Conservation Plan. Although the City is not	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	participating the CSP project and associated mitigation has been developed to complement the proposed program.				
<b>4.9</b>	<b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>				
<b>4.9-1</b>	<b>Disturb, damage, or destroy unidentified subsurface archaeological or historical resources or human remains during project construction.</b> No significant resources were identified during surveys. However, subsurface construction activities including grading or trenching could uncover previously unidentified resources.	CSP	PS	MM 4.9-1 Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist	PSU
		UR	PS	WMM 4.8-2 Cultural Resource Handling and Protection; WMM 4.8-3 Conduct Archeological Surveys.	PSU
<b>4.9-2</b>	<b>Removal of historically significant properties and/or loss of historic integrity of such resources.</b> No historical resources are known to occur in the Plan area.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.9-3</b>	<b>Disturb unknown paleontological resources during site preparation.</b> Project-related construction activities could uncover or otherwise disturb previously undiscovered or unrecorded paleontological resources.	CSP	PS	MM 4.9-2 Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Paleontologist	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.8-11, Policies to Ensure Proper Handling of Paleontological Resources	LTS
<b>4.9-4</b>	<b>Damage or destroy historical, archaeological, prehistoric, or paleontological resources during construction of off-site infrastructure.</b> Construction of utility lines and roadway improvements could result in impacts to historic resources.	CSP	PS	MM 4.9-1 Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist; MM 4.9-2 Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Paleontologist; MM 4.9-3 Conduct Appropriate Off-site Studies	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.8-3 Conduct Archeological Surveys; WMM 4.8-11 Include Policies to	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
				Ensure Proper Handling of Paleontological Resources; WMM 4.8-13 Conduct Appropriate Studies	
<b>4.10</b>	<b>Hazardous Materials and Public Safety</b>				
<b>4.10-1</b>	<b>Increased potential for accidental release or spill of hazardous materials during construction or occupancy.</b> Hazardous materials in the Plan area would require compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Furthermore, the City of Roseville performs annual inspections of all businesses utilizing hazardous materials and requires each business to file a Hazardous Materials Management Plan.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.10-2</b>	<b>Increased demand for hazardous materials incident response.</b> Conformance with CCR, UBC and the UFC, as well as the development of the additional fire station, would provide hazardous materials incident response services. In addition, General Plan Safety Element Policies and compliance with applicable federal and state laws that are administered by the Fire Department would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.10-3</b>	<b>Increased risk of soil or water contamination from improper disposal of household hazardous waste.</b> The City of Roseville's existing household hazardous waste programs would ensure that risk is minimized.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.10-4	<b>Soil or groundwater contamination from past uses.</b> Past practices associated with the rural residential uses could have resulted in some minor areas of potential soil contamination.	CSP	PS	MM 4.10-1 Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.9-2 Soil Contamination Policies	LTS
4.10-5	<b>Use of recycled water for landscape in areas accessible to the public.</b> Recycled water would be conveyed to the CSP for use in irrigation for parks, and landscaping in medians, landscaping for commercial areas and common areas in high density residential neighborhoods.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.10-6	<b>Potential effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF) from high-voltage transmission lines.</b> Power lines, electrical wiring and appliances all produce electric and magnetic fields. Development of the project area would increase the number of people who would be exposed to potential risks associated with EMF.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.11</b>	<b>Public Services</b>				
4.11.1	<b>Increased demand for police protection services.</b> The project will increase the demand for police officers, however, the increase in personnel would not constitute an environmental impact.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.11.2	<b>Increased demand for fire protection services.</b> Development in the Plan area would result in increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services, potentially	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	PS	WMM 4.10-4 Demonstrate Adequate Response Time and WMM 4.10-6 Adopt Fire Prevention and Suppression	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service			Policies	
4.11.3	<b>Increased demand for school services.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for elementary school (K–5), middle school (6–8), and high school (8–12) services. One elementary school is included in the project. Existing capacity is available to serve middle and high school students outside the plan area.	CSP	LTS for school capacity and PS for safe routes to schools	MM 4.11-3 Safe Routes to School	LTS
		UR	LTS for school capacity and PS for safe routes to schools	WMM 4.10-7 Designate school sites as needed, and WMM 4.10-8 School Transportation Policies	LTS
4.11.4	<b>Increased demand on library services.</b> While the proposed project would increase the demand for library services, the project would not result in a significant physical impact on the environment.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.11.5	<b>Increased demand for park facilities.</b> The CSP will be required to comply with the city's park standards and/or pay in lieu fees.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Public Utilities</b>				
4.12.1-1	<b>Availability of water supplies to meet demand in normal/wet years.</b> The City has sufficient existing surface water supplies to meet the needs of the project.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.1-2	<b>Availability of water supplies to meet demand in dry years.</b> The City would rely on its surface water entitlements and would supplement with groundwater during dry or driest years consistent with	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	City General Plan policies.				
4.12.1-3	<b>Impact on American River and Delta Associated with the Diversion of the amount of surface water needed for project.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.1-4	<b>Capacity of water treatment system to meet potable demand.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.1-5	<b>Extension of potable water distribution system.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.1-6	<b>Groundwater Use</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None Required	LTS
4.12.1-7	<b>Changes in Groundwater Recharge potential through development of impervious surfaces</b>	CSP	LTS	None Required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None Required	LTS
4.12.2-1	<b>Availability of recycled water to meet demand and installation of recycled water infrastructure.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.3-1	<b>Construction or expansion of wastewater collection facilities.</b> The project will construct needed infrastructure to connect with the City's wastewater collection system.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.3-2	<b>Capacity of Wastewater Treatment Facilities.</b> The project along with other foreseeable projects within the service area boundary would require the expansion of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant.	CSP	S	MM 4.12.3-1 Treatment Plant Capacity	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.11-6 Treatment Plant Capacity.	LTS
4.12.3-3	<b>Construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities.</b> The project along with other foreseeable projects within	CSP	S	MM 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Expansion	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	the service area boundary would require the expansion of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant.	UR	S	MM 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Expansion	LTS
4.12.3-4	<b>Water quality impacts from wastewater discharges beyond the SPWA 2005 Service Area Boundary.</b>	CSP	S	MM 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Capacity	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.11-6 Treatment Plant Expansion Policies	LTS
4.12.4-1	<b>Increased demand for solid waste services at the materials recovery facility.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.4-2	<b>Increased demand for solid waste services at the landfill.</b> The proposed project has the potential to reduce the life of the landfill.	CSP	S	WMM 4.11-7 Expand the WRSL Landfill	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.11-7 Expand the WRSL Landfill	SU
4.12.4-3	<b>Expansion of the landfill.</b>	CSP	S	WMM 4.11-7 Expand the WRSL Landfill	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.11-7 Expand the WRSL Landfill	SU
4.12.4-4	<b>Construction debris demand for solid waste services.</b>	CSP	S	WMM 4.11-11 Divert Construction Debris	SU
		UR	S	WMM 4.11-11 Divert construction Debris	SU
4.12.5-1	<b>Increased demand for electricity.</b> RE has sufficient electric supplies to serve the project.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.5-2	<b>Increased demand for natural gas.</b> PG&E has indicated it has sufficient natural gas to serve the project.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS
4.12.5-3	<b>Increased demand on cable television and telephone services.</b> While the project would increase demand for cable and phone service this is not a significant environmental impact.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	LTS	None required	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
<b>4.13</b>	<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
4.13-1	<b>Changes in the rate of stormwater runoff (peak flows) through the development of new impervious surfaces.</b> The project would convert rural land to urban uses which would increase runoff.	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.12-1 Prepare Site Specific Drainage Study	LTS
4.13-2	<b>Changes in the rate of stormwater peak flows entering the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.12-1 Prepare Site Specific Drainage Study	LTS
4.13-3	<b>Increase in the amount of surface runoff, which would exceed the capacity of existing storm drainage systems and increase the potential for downstream flooding.</b> The Project would increase impervious surfaces, which could generate additional stormwater runoff. This would increase the volume of surface runoff entering Curry Creek watershed over existing conditions. In addition, development and grading would alter the existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities on the properties.	CSP	S	WMM 4.12-2 Pay Fair Share of Roseville Regional Stormwater Retention Facility Improvements.	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.12-2 Pay Fair Share of Roseville Regional Stormwater Retention Facility Improvements and WMM 4.12-3 Retention Policies	LTS
4.13-4	<b>Placement of fill or structures in 100-year floodplain could affect water surface elevations, which could increase the risk of flooding.</b>	CSP	LTS	None required	LTS
		UR	S	WMM 4.12-4 Floodplain Policies	LTS

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
4.13-5	<p><b>Erosion and runoff from construction sites containing soil or other materials could degrade water quality if discharged to local streams.</b> Project developers are required by state law to obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. They are also required under by City ordinance (RMC Chapter 14.20) to fully comply with the State construction permit and reduce pollutants to the maximum extant practicable. Compliance with the permit would involve creation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP and the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), as outlined in the SWPPP.</p>	CSP	S	MM 4.13-1 Implementation of Construction Activity Stormwater Protection Standards	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.13-1 Implementation of Construction Activity Stormwater Standards, MM 4.13-2 Stormwater Management Development Standards and MM 4.13-3 Water Quality Policies	LTS
4.13-6	<p><b>Changes in surface water or groundwater quality resulting from urban stormwater runoff.</b> Development in the CSP would result in a change in the types and amounts of pollutants discharged through stormwater outfalls as undeveloped land is converted to urban uses.</p>	CSP	S	MM 4.13-2 Stormwater management development standards	LTS
		UR	S	MM 4.13-3 Storm water quality policies	LTS
<b>4.14</b>	<b>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>				
4.14-1	<p><b>Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity.</b> Development of the project area would convert over 368 acres of currently undeveloped grassland to urban uses. The introduction of residences, commercial uses, and</p>	CSP	S	None available	SU
		UR	S	None available	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve

**TABLE 3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Number	Impact	CSP or UR	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
	infrastructure in an area that is present undeveloped would change the existing visual character of the area.				
4.14-2	<b>New sources of light and glare.</b> The introduction of artificial light into a rural area contributes to the change in that area's character. In addition, lighting can be an annoyance if it spills into backyards or homes, as it can interfere with sleeping, watching television or other activities. Development of the project area would result in light from urban development such as residences and commercial uses, as well as recreational facilities, streetlights, and vehicles.	CSP	S	MM 4.14-1 Site lighting as to minimize nuisance; MM 4.14-2 Use low glare materials for new development; MM 4.14-3 Avoid light spill over into Curry Creek and open space areas;	SU
		UR	PS	WMM 4.13-2 Light and Glare Policies	SU
4.14-3	<b>Degradation of scenic resources and scenic vistas.</b> While no designated scenic resources are present, the project site would block views to the Sierras and surrounding areas.	CSP	S	Compliance with the City's General Plan, Communitywide Design Guidelines and the CSP Design Guidelines	SU
		UR	S	Compliance with the City's General Plan, Communitywide Design Guidelines and the CSP Design Guidelines	SU

NI = No Impact      LTS = Less-than-significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant  
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable      CSP = Creekview Specific Plan      UR = Urban Reserve