



Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Project Title/File Number: Westbrook Specific Plan Amendment to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (File Number: 2011PL-043)

Project Location: Northwest corner of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area, south of the future extension of Pleasant Grove Boulevard

Project Description: The applicant requests approval of the following: a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Development Agreement and Large Lot Map to allow development of approximately 397 acres of land within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan including: low-, medium- and high- residential densities, commercial, open space, school, and parks.

Project Applicant: Westpark Associates

Property Owner: Westpark SV 400, LLC

Lead Agency Contact Person: Kathy Pease, Senior Planner
Phone (916) 774-5434

DECLARATION

The Planning Director determined that the above project will have no new significant effects on the environment that cannot be mitigated.

The determination is based on the following findings:

- 1) The Westbrook property was zoned Urban Reserve with the adoption of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan.
- 2) An EIR (SCH# 2008032115) was prepared for the Specific Plan dated May 10, 2010. Acknowledging that urban development was likely as part of the annexation proposal, the EIR analyzed buildout of the Westbrook property at a program level.
- 3) The project is consistent with the buildout assumptions in the EIR.
- 4) There are no new significant impacts that were not examined in or covered by the program EIR for the Specific Plan that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

- 5) There are no potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts, which were not adequately addressed or discussed in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR.
- 6) There are no previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the Sierra Vista EIR was certified, that are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. .
- 7) The project incorporates all applicable mitigation measures identified in the EIR.
- 8) This mitigated negative declaration reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

Written comments shall be submitted during the 30-day review period, during which the lead agency will receive comments. Appeal of this determination must be made during the review period.

Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and all related documents can be found on the City's website: www.roseville.ca.us and at the Permit Center located at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 during normal business hours.

Review period: April 5th- May 7, 2012

Public Hearing:

A public hearing on this item will be held on April 26, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. before the Planning Commission and will be held in the City of Roseville Council Chambers located at 311Vernon Street, Roseville, California.

Submit Comments to:

Kathy Pease, AICP
Senior Planner
Roseville Planning Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Initial Study Prepared By:



Kathy Pease, Senior Planner

INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number:	Westbrook Specific Plan Amendment to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan	
Project Location:	Northwest corner of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area, south of the future extension of Pleasant Grove Boulevard	
Project Description:	The applicant requests approval of the following: a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Development Agreement and Large Lot Map to allow development of approximately 397 acres of land within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan including: low-, medium- and high-residential densities, commercial, open space, school, and parks.	
Project Applicant:	Westpark Associates	
Property Owner:	Westpark SV 400, LLC	
Lead Agency Contact Person:	Kathy Pease, Senior Planner	Phone (916) 774-5434

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above described project application. The document relies on a combination of a previous environmental document and site-specific studies to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the proposed project. In particular, this initial study assesses the extent to which the impacts of the proposed project have already been addressed in the certified Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan ("SVSP"), as approved by the Roseville City Council in May 2010. In some instances, the City or consultants reporting to the City undertook new site-specific analyses to confirm whether particular impacts from the proposed project would be the same as, or no worse than, those disclosed in the SVSP EIR. A site-specific study was also used where the City determined that particular impacts of the proposed project – "Existing Plus Project" traffic impacts – had not been thoroughly addressed in the EIR.

This initial study has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects. More particularly, this initial study has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15063 and 15168.

Section 15063 is the provision of the CEQA Guidelines that lays out the general rules for preparing initial studies. One of the identified functions of an initial study is for a lead agency to "[d]etermine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project's effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration. *** The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration." (CEQA

Guidelines, § 15063, subd. (b)(1)(C).). Here, the City has used this initial study to determine the extent to which the SVSP EIR has “adequately examined” the effects of the proposed project.

Section 15168 sets forth the legal requirements for preparing “program EIRs” and for relying on such documents in connection with “[s]ubsequent activities” within an approved program. (See *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 598, 614-617.) The SVSP EIR was a program EIR with respect to its analysis of impacts associated with eventual build-out of properties that, at the time of City Council action on the SVSP, were shown as having an “urban reserve” designation. The land on which the proposed project is located was one such property. Subdivision (c) of section 15168 provides as follows:

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
 - (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.
 - (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.
 - (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.
 - (4) Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.

Consistent with these principles, this initial study serves the function of a “written checklist or similar device” documenting the extent to which the environmental effects of the proposed project “were covered in the program EIR” for the SVSP. As the reader will see, in many instances the City has concluded that, indeed, the impacts of the proposed project are “within the scope” of the analysis in the SVSP EIR. Stated another way, these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR.” Where particular impacts were not thoroughly analyzed in that prior document, the City has required the preparation of additional site-specific studies.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the City as lead agency, finds substantial evidence that any effects of the project were not “adequately examined” in the SVSP or were not “within the scope” of the analysis in that document and may have a significant effect on the environment, the City would be required to prepare an EIR with respect to such potentially significant effects. On the other hand, if the City found no substantial evidence that these unaddressed project impacts may be significant, a negative declaration would be appropriate. If in the course of analysis, the City identified potentially significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation measures to which the applicant agrees, the impact would be considered to be reduced to a less than significant effect, and a mitigated negative declaration would be appropriate.

As noted earlier, site-specific studies have been prepared for the project with respect to impacts that were not "adequately examined" in the SVSP EIR or were not "within the scope" of the prior analysis. Based on its review of these studies as well as its review of various analyses found in the SVSP, the City of Roseville Planning Department has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15070

Prepared by: Kathy Pease
Kathy Pease, Senior Planner

Date: 4/3/2012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Annexation of the project area into the City of Roseville by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) occurred in January 2012, as part of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. The current zoning is Urban Reserve.

The project includes several approvals. These include amendments to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which would allow for future development of approximately 397 acres of the site with a mix of uses. The Applicant also requests approval of a General Plan Amendment and rezoning to change the Urban Reserve designation to 141 acres (705 units) of LDR (low density residential), 79 acres (635 units) of MDR (medium density residential) and 28 acres (689 units) of HDR (high density residential). In addition, 6 acres of CMU (commercial mixed use), 37 acres of CC/GC (general commercial) uses, 11 acres of public/quasi-public uses including an elementary school, 16 acres of parks and 36 acres of open space are proposed.

**TABLE 1
 PROPOSED LAND USES**

Land Use Type	Dwelling Units/ Acreage
Single Family	1,340 dwelling units
Multi-Family	689 dwelling units
Retail ¹	37 acres
Commercial Mixed-Use ²	6.3 acres
Elementary School ³	10 acres
Parks	15.5 acres
Open Space	36.6 acres

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located at 2801 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, which is within the boundaries of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, approved by the City Council in May 2010. The site is within one of two Urban Reserve areas of the plan, formerly referred to as the Richland Property. The second Urban Reserve area, referred to as the Chan parcel, is not a part of this project.

Westbrook (the Project) is bordered by unincorporated Placer County to the west (see Figure 1). The adjacent parcels to the east and south of the project site are part of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area. To the north and east of the subject parcel is the West Roseville Specific Plan area.

¹ Assumed retail to develop with a 25% Floor-to-Area ratio, which yields 402,930 square feet of leasable retail space.

² Assumed CMU to develop with a 40% Floor-to-Area ratio, which yields 109,771 square feet of leasable space, of which 50% is retail and 50% is office.

³ Assumed to have 750 students based on school size and enrollment levels at similar schools in Roseville.

**FIGURE 1
PROPOSED LAND USE PLAN**



Physical or Natural Features On-Site

The project site is currently undeveloped and is comprised mostly of annual grasslands. No structures are present. An intermittent drainage channel traverses a portion of the property. This drainage channel and other wetlands are identified as waters of the United States, therefore a Section 404 permit must be obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to fill the wetlands. No native oak trees are present on the site.

Physical or Natural Features on Adjacent Property

Development has been approved to the north, south, east and west of the subject property, although currently only the lands to the north are undeveloped.

- The property is directly south of the West Roseville Specific Plan, south of the planned extension of Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
- West of the property is the approved Regional University Specific Plan in un-incorporated Placer County.
- South of the project boundaries are other portions of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan.

At buildout, the entire Sierra Vista Specific Plan area, including the Westbrook property, will provide for approximately 8,679 dwelling units, accommodate roughly 22,045 residents, add approximately 4.1 -million square feet of retail and office uses, and provide in excess of 9,000 jobs.

TABLE 2

PROPOSED WESTBROOK LAND USE, ZONING, & ACREAGE BY PARCEL

PARCEL	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE (Specific Plan Land Use)	ZONING	ACRES	ALLOCATED UNITS	FINALED UNITS	AVAILABLE UNITS	DENSITY
WB-1	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	19.1	96	0	0	5.0
WB-2	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	18.9	95	0	0	5.0
WB-3	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	14.1	71	0	0	5.0
WB-4	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	11.7	59	0	0	5.0
WB-5	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	30.4	150	0	0	5.0
WB-6	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	31.0	155	0	0	5.0
WB-7	LDR (Residential)	RS/DS	15.8	79	0	0	5.0
WB-20	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	20.3	162	0	0	8.0
WB-21	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	8.1	65	0	0	8.0
WB-22	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	13.1	104	0	0	8.0
WB-23	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	16.2	130	0	0	8.0
WB-24	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	7.5	60	0	0	8.0
WB-25	MDR (Residential)	RS/DS	14.2	114	0	0	8.0
WB-30	HDR (Residential)	R3	4.8	120	0	0	25.0
WB-31	HDR (Residential)	R3	8.2	207	0	0	25.0
WB-32	HDR (Residential)	R3	8.0	200	0	0	25.0
WB-33	HDR (Residential)	R3	6.5	162	0	0	25.0
WB-40	Commercial Mixed Use	CMU/SA	6.2				
WB-41	CC (Commercial)	CC	19.3				
WB-42	CC (Commercial)	CC	12.9				
WB-43	CC (Commercial)	CC	4.3				
WB-50	PR (Park)	PR	9.6				
WB-51	PR (Park)	PR	4.4				
WB-52	PR (Park)	PR	1.5				
WB-60	Public/Quasi-Public (Elementary School)	P/QP	10.0				
WB-61	Public/Quasi-Public (Well)	P/QP	0.3				
WB-62	Public/Quasi-Public (Lift Station)	P/QP	0.8				
WB-80	OS (Open Space)	OS	36.6				
WB-100	ROW/Landscape Corridors	ROW	43.6				
sub-totals (Westbrook)			397.4	2,029	0	0	

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

SIERRA VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN

For reasons explained earlier, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) and the related Final EIR are referenced and utilized in the evaluation of this project, which is part of the area analyzed in the SVSP EIR. The SVSP represents the most recent significant change in land use in the City and allocation of new land use to the City following the amendment of the General Plan in 2010. Annexation of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area in January 2012 added approximately 2,064 acres (including the 397 acre project site) to the City's corporate limits.

The SVSP allows for a mix of land uses such as commercial, business professional, park, open space, and schools. The original SVSP approval proposed 6,650 new residential dwelling units. Processing of the SVSP also resulted in an update to the City's 2020 General Plan to the year 2025. At the time the SVSP was being processed, the subject property was not a participant in the specific plan, although the property was included in the annexation and analyzed in the SVSP EIR. It was given an "Urban Reserve" designation in the SVSP, which acknowledges that urban development is likely following annexation, but does not assign project-specific uses for the property. Westpark, the current property owner, has applied for a General Plan Amendment and Re-zoning for specific land uses for its portion of the Urban Reserve which is shown on Figure 1 with the proposed land use designations.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it was determined that the Sierra Vista Specific Plan had the potential to have a significant adverse impact upon the environment, and the SVSP EIR (SCH #2008032115) was prepared for the project. A Notice of Completion was filed with the State of California Office of Planning and Research. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was certified by the City Council on May 20, 2010, and a Notice of Determination was filed on May 21, 2010. A copy of the SVSP EIR is available for review within the Planning Department at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when it certified the SVSP EIR. The EIR identified the following impacts associated with development of the SVSP area, including the buildout of the Urban Reserve Areas, as significant and unavoidable:

- Conversion of agricultural land to developed uses
- Inducement of substantial population growth
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on State Highways, including Interstate 80
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM10 from grading and trenching activities (short term)
- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term)
- Increased emissions of air pollutants during operation
- Loss of oak trees of greater than 6 inches diameter breast height (dbh) (short-term)
- Removal of historically significant properties and/or loss of historic integrity of such resources
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)

- Construction debris demand for solid waste services
- Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity
- New sources of light and glare

For buildout of the SVSP project area, the SVSP EIR also identified the following cumulative impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- Agricultural land conversion
- Air pollutant emissions from construction
- Air pollutant emissions from operation
- Contribution to greenhouse gas emissions/global warming
- On-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Off-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Traffic impacts to Roseville, Placer County, Sacramento County, Sutter County and State facilities
- Increased demand for water
- Increased demand for recycled water distribution system
- Increased generation of solid waste
- Change in visual character

The EIR identified project-specific mitigation for the specific plan and program-level mitigation for the Urban Reserve, which were adopted by the City and incorporated into the SVSP. Now that a project is proposed for this Urban Reserve area, the applicant, Westpark Associates, also has agreed to incorporate the SVSP project-specific mitigation measures into the Westbrook project. A Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) that identifies the project-specific mitigation measures from the EIR will be adopted as part of this project. As explained earlier, this Initial Study analyzes the impacts of the Westbrook project in relation to the analysis completed in the SVSP EIR.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATING POLICIES AND STANDARDS

"[R]equiring compliance with environmental regulations is a common and reasonable mitigating measure." (*Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337, 1355, quoting *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296, 308.) Conditions of Approval requiring such compliance are "proper where the public agency ha[s] meaningful information reasonably justifying an expectation of mitigation of environmental effects." (*Leonoff, supra*, 222 Cal.App.3d at p. 1355, citing *Sundstrom, supra*, 202 Cal.App.3d at pp. 308-309.) In March 2003, the City of Roseville made formal findings to the effect that the following City regulations and ordinances, which include standards and policies that are uniformly applied throughout the City (together, "regulations"), will substantially mitigate specified environmental effects of future projects.

- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])

- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)
- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- City of Roseville Grading Ordinance (RMC Ch.16.20)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines
- Specific Plan Design Guidelines:
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan

In conducting the analysis below, City staff has assumed that, to the extent that they are applicable to the proposed project, these regulations will be enforced, thereby substantially mitigating the significant effects of the proposed project addressed by these regulations.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The initial study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. Set forth in Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, the checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project. Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions, as follows:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
5. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the impact does not require mitigation or result in a substantial or potentially substantial change of any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.

6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).
7. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

As demonstrated in the checklist discussions below and the discussion that follows, no project changes or changes in circumstances surrounding the project since May 2010 have resulted in any new significant environmental effects not already addressed in the SVSP EIR or any substantial increases in the severity of any previously identified significant effects.

Initial Study Checklist

1. Aesthetics

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project will convert approximately 361 acres of vacant parcels to urban development and will preserve approximately 36 acres in open space. The project site was covered at a program-level in the SVSP EIR. The EIR identified that the loss of rural grasslands with urban development was an unavoidable significant impact for which the City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations⁴.

⁴ Page 4.14-15 SVSP Final EIR.

Light and glare will increase above the existing condition. As identified in the SVSP Final EIR, any introduction of urban uses would increase ambient nighttime illumination and result in a significant unavoidable change in the amount of light generated on the project site. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable.⁵

Future development of the Urban Reserve area would result in the obstruction of view corridors to the Sierras and views toward the undeveloped portions of Placer County. This was considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact⁶.

Based on the information presented above, all of the aesthetic impacts were previously identified as significant and unavoidable. The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

2. Agricultural Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X		
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X		
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-			X		

⁵ Page 4.14-20 of the SVSP Final EIR.

⁶ Page 4.14-22 of the SVSP Final EIR.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
agricultural use?					

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

As identified in the FEIR, development of the project site will change the character of the site by replacing fallow land with residential, commercial, open space, and public infrastructure. The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classify the site as “Farmland of Local Importance”. The soils are generally unsuitable for many agricultural uses beyond grazing. Even so, the loss of grazing land was determined to be a significant impact⁷.

Development of the project site would result in the loss of 361 acres to urban development. Approximately 36 acres will remain in open space.

The project will incorporate, and the Applicant has agreed to comply with, Mitigation MM 4.1-2 from the SVSP FEIR⁸. Under that measure, one acre will be preserved within Placer County for each acre of open space impacted within the specific plan area, through the recordation of conservation easements. With this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to agricultural uses. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project]. . . were covered in the program EIR.”

⁷ Page 4.1-72 of the FEIR

⁸ Page 4.1-73 of the FEIR

3. Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	X				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X				
c) 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 (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X				
g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The air quality impacts of build-out of the SVSP, as well as impacts related to climate change, were analyzed in the Final EIR for the SVSP. As noted earlier, the EIR found the following air quality impacts to be significant and unavoidable:

- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM10 from grading and trenching activities (short term);

- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term);
- Cumulative air pollutant emissions from construction;
- Cumulative air pollutant emissions from operation; and
- Contribution to greenhouse gas emissions/global warming.

In order to verify whether the environmental effects of the proposed project related to air quality and greenhouse gases were adequately examined in the SVSP EIR, the City commissioned an expert analysis by Ascent Environmental, a Sacramento consulting firm with recognized expertise in air quality. The following analysis is based on an air quality and climate change analysis prepared for the project in October 2011 by Ascent Environmental. A copy of that report is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The report focused on the potential impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project, on both a project and cumulative level, in the context of the existing regional and local air quality conditions and regulations. City staff has reviewed the documentation, which it understands was prepared with input from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). City staff is also aware that Ascent has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and prepared in good faith. Based on its own review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Ascent report. Where potentially significant air quality impacts were identified, mitigation measures from the SVSP EIR, acceptable to the applicant, have been described that would reduce or eliminate the impacts, and have been included in the discussion of checklist answers below.

Air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) is monitored through the efforts of various international, federal, State, regional and local government agencies. These agencies work jointly and individually to improve air quality through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a-c) The City of Roseville, along with south Placer County, is located within the federal Sacramento Ozone Non-attainment Area. The PCAPCD is required to comply with and implement the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to demonstrate when and how the region can attain the federal ozone standards. Currently the districts within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (consisting of Placer, Sacramento, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Shasta and Solano counties) are working together to finalize the attainment plan, which is aimed at attainment of the federal 8-hour ozone standard. The PCAPCD has established standard air quality thresholds, discussed below. The Ascent study determined that the proposed project would produce ozone precursor emissions above the PCAPCD thresholds during construction, periods of operation and construction overlap, and during cumulative conditions. The findings of the Ascent study are summarized as follows:

Construction Emissions

Project related construction activities would generate air pollutants intermittently within the site, and the vicinity of the site, until all construction phases have been completed. The air pollutant emission sources would include the following:

- Emission from construction equipment;
- Dust from grading and infrastructure improvements; and
- Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) emissions from road surfacing and architectural coating.

The Ascent study estimated the pollutant levels from the above construction related activities based on the project size. Ascent determined that the ROG and PM₁₀ levels are the only pollutants that would exceed the thresholds designated by the PCAPCD and that may contribute to the District's nonattainment status for ozone and expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. However, as demonstrated in the table below, with mitigation, the potentially significant PM₁₀ impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.

**TABLE 3
 SUMMARY OF MODELED MAXIMUM DAILY CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT
 AND PRECURSOR EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES**

Construction Activity	ROG	NO_x	CO	PM₁₀	PM₂₅
Unmitigated	156	35	64	133	29
Mitigated	156*	30	64	34	9
PCAPCD Thresholds	82	82	550	82	N/A

Note*: Mitigation that addressed exhaust emissions of PM₁₀ and NO_x from off-road equipment would also reduce exhaust emissions of ROG equipment by approximately 5%, or 0.1 lb/day, which is not reflected in the table due to rounding. Nearly all ROG emissions associated with construction activities are evaporative emissions of ROG from the application of architectural coatings and from asphalt paving. This mitigation would also result in a reduction in CO; however, the reduction achieved by this measure cannot be quantified.

As demonstrated, with mitigation the construction related PM₁₀ levels are reduced to 34 lbs/day which is below the PCAPCD threshold with mitigation. This is substantially less than identified in the SVSP FEIR, which anticipated that grading within the overall specific plan area would generate more than 82 lbs/day of emissions with mitigation and anticipated the impact to be significant and unavoidable⁹. With implementation of MM 4.4-1, which requires extensive dust and construction emissions control measures¹⁰, Westbrook would still have significant ROG emissions.

Operational Emissions

Once construction of the project has ended, the operation of the project's commercial uses will generate emissions of pollutants from vehicles and area sources such as HVAC units. The Ascent study took into account the City's General Plan goals and policies for energy-saving and reduction emissions as well as the project's proximity to residential, provision for retail services, and the pedestrian and alternative transportation connectivity within the site and to existing paths, when operations emissions estimates were prepared for the project. The predicted operational emissions for the project during operation are as follows:

⁹ Page 4.4-31 of the FEIR.

¹⁰ Page 4.4-47 of the FEIR.

TABLE 4
OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Operations 2025 Buildout	ROG (lbs/day)	NO_x (lbs/day)	PM₁₀ (lbs/day)	PM₂₅ (lbs/day)
Mobile Source	134	110	460	87
Area Source	140	29	0.2	0.2
Total Operational	273	129	460.2	87.2
PCAPCD Thresholds	82	82	82	N/A

As indicated, the maximum project operational emissions would be above the PCAPCD thresholds of significance, consistent with the analysis in the SVSP Final EIR.

The project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of ROG and/or NOX that would contribute to the district's severe non-attainment designation. In order to improve air quality and attain the health-based standards, reductions in emissions are necessary within non-attainment areas. The rapid growth and combined population, vehicle usage, and business activity within a non-attainment area, to which the project would cumulatively contribute, would either delay attainment of the standards or require the adoption of additional controls on existing and future air pollution sources to offset project-related emission increases.

The SVSP identified that operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable¹¹. Project specific mitigation measures would be required of the project as identified in the FEIR under mitigation MM 4.5-1 (Air Quality Measures), which would reduce operational emissions¹².

In addition, the project would cumulatively contribute to regional air quality health effects through emissions of criteria and mobile source TACs.

Based on the traffic analysis prepared for the project, some signalized intersection in the vicinity of the project site are predicted to operate at less than level of service C under build out conditions. However, none of the intersections would be anticipated to accommodate volumes of traffic that would exceed 31,600 vehicles in any single hour¹³. This would not result in CO concentrations that would exceed or contribute to an exceedance of the state or national standards¹⁴.

Further, the project would not result in significant toxic air contaminants or exposure to future sensitive receptors to excessive odors.

¹¹ Page 4.4-32 of the FEIR.

¹² Page 4.5-40 of the FEIR.

¹³ Fehr & Peers, Traffic Study 2011

¹⁴ Ascent Air Quality Study 2011.

Climate Change

The project would generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction and during the operational life of the project. Construction of land uses could begin as early as 2013 and full buildout of the project area would occur over a 20- to 30-year period. Emission levels are anticipated to change over time due to improvements in engine technology, retrofits, and turnover in the equipment fleet, therefore it is estimated that there will be increased fuel efficiency over time. Based on current models the following table shows that project GHG emissions will exceed 8.4 metric tons per year. As a point of reference, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has determined that 4.6 tons per year is significant. Therefore, the proposed project is considered to have significant unavoidable impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. This conclusion is consistent with the SVSP FEIR, which concluded that buildout of the project area would cause significant and unavoidable impacts in this category.¹⁵

**TABLE 5
 SUMMARY OF MODELED PROJECT- RELATED
 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Construction Related GHG Emissions	
Total Construction Emissions	3,507 MT CO ₂
Amortization Period	30 Years
Amortized Construction Emissions	129 MT CO ₂ /Year
Operational GHG Emissions under Full Buildout 2025	CO₂ MT/Year
Transportation (mobile sources)	43,015
Area Sources	7,917
Electricity Consumption	1,262
Water Conveyance, Treatment, Distribution, and Wastewater Treatment	550
Amortized Construction Emissions	88
Total Operational Emissions	52,861
Service Population (residents + jobs)	6,293
GHG Efficiency	8.4 MT CO₂e/SP/Year

Mitigation Measures MM 4.5-1 (Air Quality Measures) and MM 4.5-2 (Additional Measures to Reduce GHG Emissions) will be required for the project.¹⁶ Consistent with the conclusions of the SVSP Final EIR, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation.

¹⁵ Page 4.5-34 of the FEIR.

¹⁶ Page 4.5-40 and page 4.5-41 to 4.5-47 of the FEIR.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified air quality impacts and impacts relating to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to air quality or greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the Ascent report verifies, and the City finds, that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

4. Biological Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		
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?			X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,					

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project site is undeveloped and several potential biological resources have been identified on-site, including wetlands, drainage channels, grasslands, and wildlife. A biological consultant, with Gibson and Skordal (Exhibit B of the IS) was consulted to determine if any changes have occurred to the site since adoption of the FEIR, and whether development of the site would have greater impacts than anticipated in the EIR. City staff has reviewed the documentation, and is aware that the firm of Gibson and Skordal has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible and based on good faith analysis. Based on its own review of the analysis and these other considerations, City staff accepts the conclusions in the Gibson and Skordal report. No changes or new impacts were identified by Gibson and Skordal. The following is a discussion of the potential impacts and mitigation measures.

Wetlands:

The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulate activities affecting wetlands and other waters. Wetlands and vernal pools meet the Corps’ criteria of an “other waters” feature with the presence of a defined bed and bank, scouring, and drift lines. The site has been evaluated by Gibson and Skordal for project specific impacts to wetlands and other waters. Grading and filing on the site would result in the loss of wetlands.

**TABLE 6
 WESTBROOK WETLANDS WITH THE WESTBROOK AMENDMENT**

Jurisdictional Wetland Summary for Sierra Vista Specific Plan with the Addition of Westbrook		
Wetland Type	Pre-Development Acreage	Impacted Acreage ¹
Ephemeral Stream	0.0625 ac.	0.0415 ac.
Intermittent Stream	6.0172 ac.	0.7978 ac.
Perennial Stream	2.15 ac.	1.433 ac.
Pond	2.067 ac.	1.0450 ac.
Perennial Marsh	0.859 ac.	0.8483 ac.
Seasonal Wetland	7.7677 ac.	5.0613 ac.
Wetland Swale	19.7014 ac.	17.9587 ac.

Vernal Pool	11.3461 ac.	7.0460 ac.
TOTAL	49.9709 ac.	34.2316 ac.

1. These impacts do not include off-site impacts to wetlands. Refer to SVSP EIR for additional information for off-site impacts.

Implementation of the mitigation measures (MM4.8-1 (a) and MM 4.8-1 (b)) listed in the SVSP FEIR¹⁷ by the Westbrook project would ensure that permits are obtained from federal agencies and adherence to the permit would further ensure that the project will result in “no net loss” of wetlands/waters, and that discharge into the waters is regulated. Therefore, with mitigation measures, impacts to wetlands/waters and associated vernal pool/loss of associated rare plants are considered less than significant with mitigation. For these reasons, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific] operation were covered in the program EIR.”

Special Status Wildlife

Several special-status wildlife species are known to occur or potentially occur within the project site (Western spadefoot, Swainson’s hawk, Burrowing owl, and other legally protected raptors). The loss of vegetation could destroy nesting habitat. Therefore, consistent with the mitigation measures, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted to confirm the absence of special status wildlife. Sierra Vista FEIR mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project as outlined on pages 4.8-81, 4.8-85, and 4.8-89 of the FEIR: MM 4.8-1 (a) (*No Net Loss of Wetlands*); MM 4.8-2 (*Relocate Western Spadefoots*); MM 4.8-3 (*Avoid Nesting Sites*); MM 4.8-4 (*Offsite and On-site Preservation Grassland Habitat*). With the mitigation measures the impact, is considered less than significant. For these reasons, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

Migration Corridors

Development could cause fragmentation of open space areas, which creates isolated islands of wildlife habitat. Sierra Vista FEIR mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project as outlined on pages 4.8-90, and 4.14-23 of the FEIR: MM 4.8-5 (*Wildlife Movement Protection Policies*); MM 4.14-3 (*Avoid Light Spill Over in Open Space Areas*). These measures would reduce this impact to a level that is less than significant. For these reasons, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

Oak Trees and Riparian Habitat Loss

No oak trees or riparian habitat are present on the subject property. Therefore, there is no impact.¹⁸

¹⁷ Page 4.8-81 and 4.8-82 of the FEIR.

¹⁸ Page 4.8-62 and 63 of the FEIR.

Loss of Biological Resources Due to Construction of Offsite Infrastructure

Development of Westbrook may require infrastructure improvements outside of the SVSP area, such as the extension of roadways; extension of water, wastewater, recycled water from the West Roseville Specific Plan area; water tank construction within the WRSP area; and the extension of electric and natural gas lines. The extension of infrastructure could cause both direct and indirect biological impacts. The project incorporates mitigation measures to reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level: MM 4.8-87 (*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 (*Offsite and Onsite Preservation of Grassland Habitat*); MM 4.8-5 (*Wildlife Movement Protection Policies*); MM4.8-6 (*Habitat Restoration /Onsite preservation*).

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to vegetation and wetland resources. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.” Notably, the applicants will need to secure federal permits, which would further ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

5. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

No cultural or historical resources are known to exist on the project site. While it is anticipated that there will be no significant impacts to cultural resources, there is a potential that unknown prehistoric or historic cultural or paleontological resources could be uncovered during project construction. Because it is possible that some such unearthed cultural resources might qualify as “historical resources” or

“unique archeological resources” that cannot feasibly be avoided, the FEIR conservatively concluded that impacts to such resources were potentially significant and unavoidable¹⁹.

Mitigation is included that requires that, in the event of a discovery of unknown buried archeological or historic deposits, project activity in the vicinity be halted until a qualified archeologist can assess the resources and provide management (MM 4.9-1 [*Cease Work and Consult with Quality Archaeologist*])²⁰.

The project site contains geologic formations that could contain paleontological resources. Mitigation measure MM 4.9-2 (*Cease Work and Consult with Quality Archaeologist*) is incorporated into the project to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level²¹.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to cultural or paleontological resources. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

6. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X		
i) Rupture 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.)			X		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X		
iv) Landslides?			X		
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the					

¹⁹ Page 4.9-18 of the FEIR.

²⁰ Page 4.9-29 of the FEIR

²¹ Page 4.9-29 of the FEIR

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
loss of topsoil?			X		
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?			X		
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?			X		
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?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project is not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides. The project site is located in Roseville, which is in Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the South Placer area as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. Because the risk associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic related ground failure to new structures is low, the impact is less than significant.

Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. The existing and proposed slopes are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are considered less than significant.

Development of the site would result in loss of topsoil due to conversion of agricultural land to urban uses²². No area of the site contains soils that are considered prime for agricultural purposes. This impact is less than significant

Grading activities will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction, and over covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). Grading activities for the project will be limited to the project site. Grading activities require a grading permit from the Engineering Division

²² Page 4.7-22 of the FEIR.

of the Public Works Department. The grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with the City’s Improvement Standards, including the provision of proper drainage, appropriate dust control, and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures will be incorporated into the required grading plans.

Soils on the site have a high shrink-swell potential²³. A soil report is required with the submittal of the improvement plans. The City of Roseville Building Department will review construction plans before a building permit is issued and the Engineering Division will review and approve all rough grading plans to ensure that all grading and structures would withstand shrink-swell potentials and earthquake activity in this area.

A General Plan Policy requires that new homes connect to the City’s sanity sewer system. The City’s Environmental Utilities Department has reviewed the project and determined that City’s sanity sewer system can accommodate the project. No septic tanks will be permitted as part of the project. Therefore, no impact to soils relative to supporting use of septic tanks would occur.

Impacts to the geology and soils on site are considered to be less than significant.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to geologic conditions. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project]. . . were covered in the program EIR.”

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous					

²³ Page 4.7-21 of the FEIR.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		
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?			X		
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 for people residing or working in the project area?			X		
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area?			X		
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

Past use of the site for agricultural purposes could have involved the use of pesticides and/or herbicides. While the risk is low, there nonetheless could be contamination on site. Implementation of MM 4.10-1 (*Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination*) would reduce the risk of exposure to the site to a less than significant level by ensuring the soil is properly managed.²⁴

Additional households and commercial uses on the site could increase the risk of improper disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous waste impacts, however, are less than significant due to the

²⁴ Page 4.10-40 of the FEIR.

implementation of existing regulations that oversee the use and disposal of hazardous materials, according to the FEIR. Based on this information, potential impacts associated with hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.²⁵

This project is located within an area that will receive City emergency services. Development of the project area would increase the use of hazardous material, so additional hazardous materials emergency response capabilities would be needed. In the event of an emergency, Roseville Fire Department would implement hazardous materials response protocols, operations, and administrative procedures contained in the Emergency Plan. A fire station is planned within the Specific Plan area.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan area; no airports are located within two miles of the project site; and the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR regarding hazardous materials. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the			X		

²⁵ Page 4.10-26 of the FEIR.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?					
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water?			X		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X		
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X		
i) 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?			X		
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The proposed project will result in over-covering of soils with impervious surfaces such as asphalt paving and residential structures. This will result in a reduced rate of absorption of surface water runoff and will increase water being directed into the City's drainage system. The City evaluated the potential impacts related to increased runoff in the FEIR, which assumed full build-out of the site and other properties in the City and evaluated downstream flooding impacts resulting from increased surface water runoff. The FEIR found that, with the implementation of City standards and programs, the potential flooding impacts would be less than significant. No development will occur within the 100-year flood hazard area (regulatory floodplain). In addition, all homes will be located a minimum of two feet

above the 100-year floodplain elevation in accordance with the City Improvement Standards and General Plan policies. The City standards will include requirements for a drainage system designed in accordance with City standards that will adequately handle on-site drainage associated with the development of the property. The FEIR²⁶ identified that stormwater from future development of the project area would be conveyed to Curry Creek which could have a significant impact by increasing flows in Curry Creek.

An amendment to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Drainage and Stormwater Master Plan was prepared by Civil Engineering Solutions Inc., in May 2011 (Exhibit C). The amended study showed peak flow rate increases will be reduced through the excavation of wetland creation areas, vegetated treatment swales, and additional conveyance within the overbank areas of the north tributary of Curry Creek, consistent with the measures to be employed in the rest of the SVSP project area. The project plan will create 18 additional acre feet of storage within the 100-year floodplain, which will reduce peak flow increases for the 100-year event to a less than significant level. Further, the proposed project will be subject to the adopted City standards and programs. The project would be required to pay its fair share of fees toward the Roseville Regional Stormwater Retention Facility.

The project is subject to the Clean Water Act with regards to the discharge of pollutant into waters of the US. Should it be determined the project will result in direct discharges into surface waters, the developer will be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. As a condition of approval, all drainage will be collected through an on-site storm drain system and directed to the City's storm drain system. Prior to discharge from the site, the storm water shall be treated with appropriate storm water pollution treatment device(s) as required by the City's Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

The proposed project does not include any grading activities that will have an effect upon groundwater flow or quantities. Prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans, the developer shall prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City, as defined by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, to ensure that the project will not result in the release of materials that will adversely affect groundwater. Based on the above information, the impacts associated with water quality are less than significant

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to drainage and water quality. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these "environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR."

²⁶ Page 4.13-22 of the FEIR.

9. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?			X		
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The property is currently designated with a land use designation of Urban Reserve. The proposed project will increase the urban density of the parcel and amend the General Plan and Zoning designations with a mix of uses compatible with the other uses envisioned in the SVSP. With the General Plan and Zoning changes, the project would be consistent.

The FEIR found that there could be potential incompatibility of internal land uses, especially as the project builds out. Construction phases of Westbrook would involve substantial noise, truck trips and dust over a period of several years. Such activities could affect existing uses. The project would be required to comply with the City’s noise and grading ordinances. Further, the project would implement MM 4.6-1 (*Construction Noise Measures*) and MM 4.6-2 (*Commercial Noise Controls*) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.²⁷

Agricultural uses could occur adjacent to the project’s western border. As a condition of approval, future residents would be notified through deed disclosure of the proximity of agricultural uses.

The addition of development within the SVSP will be consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint Scenario, for which the City has adopted Implementation Strategies to encourage “Blueprint” compact developments. The project also assists the City in providing its “fair share” of housing units allocated in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) plan adopted by SACOG.

²⁷ Page 4.1-74

As a result of the General Plan Amendment and Rezone, no development will occur within the 100 year floodplain. The floodplain area will be preserved in Open Space. These resources will also be preserved in the Open Space land use designation area. The project will additionally dedicate 36 acres of open space, consistent with the GP policy to maximize opportunities for preservation of and maintenance of open space.

Based on the above information, the potential land use impacts associated with proposed project are considered less than significant.

The project will not divide an existing community and there are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans covering the project site. The land use and planning impacts that would occur in association with the proposed project are less than significant.

The Westbrook project is outside the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and the safety hazards area for any airport. However, the area may be subject to frequent large aircraft overflight flying under 3,000 feet. Overflights may be annoying to future residents and other sensitive uses. The FEIR therefore found this to be a significant and unavoidable impact.²⁸ As a condition of approval future residents will be notified of potential noise issues through a deed disclosure.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to land use. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

10. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X		
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?			X		

²⁸ Page 4.1-70 of the FEIR.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

As the Final EIR explained, the project site is not known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance.²⁹ Therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

11. Noise

Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X			
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X				
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X		
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	X		X		

²⁹ Page 4.7-12. See also FEIR, Appendix A (Notice of Preparation), p. 22.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

In order to verify whether the environmental effects of the proposed project related to noise were adequately examined in the SVSP EIR, the City considered an expert analysis prepared by J. C. Brennan, acoustical engineers, a consulting firm with recognized expertise in noise issues. City staff has reviewed the noise analysis, and is aware that the J.C. Brennan firm has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible. Based on its own review of the analysis, City staff accepts the conclusions in the report, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

As identified in the FEIR, construction activities on the site could expose nearby tenants/landowners to increased noise levels, including ground-born vibrations.³⁰

The FEIR identified that well drilling could be over a 24-hour period for the municipal well yet to be installed which would be a significant unavoidable impact³¹. This well would be constructed with injection capability, which could be operated as an injection well if the City's Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) program, which is currently pending environmental review, is approved by the City Council. A condition of the Westbrook project requires that the well be constructed by the landowners prior to construction of any residences within 500 feet of the well location. With this measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Development of Westbrook would also result in other similar construction-related noise impacts as identified for the SVSP. Existing residents within the WRSP could be impacted by construction activities on the northern boundary. MM 4.6-1 (*Construction Noise Reduction*) would apply. It requires compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, as well as specific measures pertaining to the siting of equipment and designation of a construction disturbance coordinator among other things.³²

Three commercial parcels (WB-40, WB-41 and WB-44) are proposed in Westbrook adjacent to proposed medium and high-density residential uses. As identified on page 4.6-29 of the FEIR, commercial facilities could exceed City standards, resulting in potentially significant impacts on adjacent residents. WMM 4.5-4 requires that the design of the commercial centers meet noise standards through the use of setbacks, barriers, and other measures. Particular attention shall be given to loading docks, onsite truck circulation, and heating and ventilation equipment. With design measures, noise impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level.

A neighborhood park is proposed in the plan area. Due to the passive nature of parks, the City has determined that neighborhood parks adjacent to residential uses are compatible. Therefore, park noise impacts are considered less than significant³³.

With urban development would be an increase in traffic and associated traffic noise levels. Residential uses could be located near roadways such as Westbrook Drive, Santucci Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This is considered a significant impact. MM 4.6-4 (*Traffic Noise Attenuation*)

³⁰ Pages 4.6-25 – 4.6-26 of the FEIR.

³¹ Page 4.6-26 of the FEIR.

³² Page 4.6-53 of the FEIR.

³³ Page 4.6-34 of the FEIR.

requires that noise barriers could be used to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 60 db Ldn exterior noise level standard along major project roadways if acoustical studies warrant sound attenuation³⁴.

It is expected that traffic noise from the project will also increase outside the project area within the existing City limits and areas of unincorporated Placer County. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable, in large part because the City does not control improvements outside the City.³⁵

The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan area. Nor is it located within two miles of an airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. However, the project site is subject to over-flight activity from McClellan Airfield, Sacramento International Airport, and Lincoln Airport. While no noise standards would be exceeded by over flight of aircraft, future residents may be annoyed by what is referred to as single event noise, by the sound of low aircraft, particularly at night. No mitigation has been identified to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The project will be conditioned to notify future residents of the potential for over-flights. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable as identified in the FEIR.³⁶

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to noise. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

12. Population and Housing

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?			X		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X		

³⁴ Page 4.6-55 of the FEIR.

³⁵ Page 4.6-44 of the FEIR.

³⁶ Page 4.6-51 of the FEIR.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers

The project will result in an increase in the number of housing units over what is currently anticipated in the General Plan. As noted above, the 2,029 additional units would result in a significant increase to the overall units within the Specific Plan planning area, which would induce substantial population growth, which was identified in the FEIR as significant and unavoidable³⁷. The FEIR identified that annexation to the City of Roseville with the extension of infrastructure and services would result in increased residences and commercial opportunities. The prospect of growth by itself, does not translate into an adverse effect on the environment. Instead growth may result in physical impacts to various kinds of natural resources such as air, water or land. It should be noted that the density is generally consistent with the densities found in the SVSP and WRSP.

The proposed project would not result in a significant change in the jobs/housing balance in the City of Roseville.³⁸

No existing buildings or residents are present in the project area; therefore, no communities would be displaced³⁹.

The project will contribute low income affordable housing units and the project will not displace affordable housing. The proposed increase in units allocated to the property will increase the number of units that can be sold at market rate, which will assist the applicant in producing the affordable units required of the project. Further, the project is subject to the City’s 10 percent affordable housing goal.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to population and housing. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

13. Public Services

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

³⁷ Page 4.2-19 of the FEIR

³⁸ Page 4.2-11 of the FEIR.

³⁹ Page 4.2-18 of the FEIR.

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			X		
b) Police protection?			X		
c) Schools?			X		
d) Other public facilities?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The Police Department has determined that the increase in development will not affect service to the area, consistent with the analysis in the FEIR⁴⁰.

Fire Station #9 is under construction in the West Plan and a new Fire Station is proposed within the SVSP. The Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined that it will be able to adequately serve the project consistent with the analysis in the FEIR⁴¹.

Schools

While the majority of the SVSP is within the Center Unified School District, most of the Urban Reserve area is within the Roseville Joint Union High School District and the Roseville City School District. The following chart shows the projected students within the Westbrook project.

**TABLE 7
 WESTBROOK STUDENT GENERATION RATES**

	LDR/MDR Students per unit	HDR Students per unit	CMU Students per unit	Students Generated
Center Unified School District				
K-6	0.354	0.046	0.046	90
7-8	0.158	0.034	0.034	47
9-12	0.272	0.042	0.042	73
Roseville City School District				
K-5	0.2930	0.1365	N/A ⁴²	360

⁴⁰ Page 4.11.5 of the FEIR.

⁴¹ Page 4.11-13 of the FEIR.

⁴² No CMU uses are proposed in the Roseville City or Roseville Unified School Districts.

6-8	0.1247	0.0407	N/A	150
Roseville Joint Unified School District				
9-12	0.161	0.036	N/A	191

The FEIR identified impacts to schools as less than significant⁴³.

As part of the project, a new elementary school within the Roseville City School District is proposed in the plan area. Approximately 150 intermediate students would attend school in the West Plan. The remaining students in grades 9-12 would add additional students within the Oakmont High attendance area, until completion of a new high school in the West Plan. With a district of 9,000 students, the impact would be less than significant.

The project would also add additional students to the Center Unified School District. It is expected that elementary and intermediate level students would attend planned schools in other portions of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area. High school students would need to be bused or drive to Center High School outside of the plan area.

Within the Center School District the increase of students anticipated to be generated from the new units would not result in the added need for new school facilities.

The project will pay school fees to each school district within its boundaries to mitigate any impacts. Under state law, such payments are deemed to constitute “full and complete mitigation” of impacts to school facilities. (Gov. Code, § 65995, subd. (h).)

The project will implement MM 4.11.3 (*Safe Routes to School*), which requires the applicant to work with the school districts to identify safe routes to school both within and outside the plan area⁴⁴.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to public services. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c) (4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

⁴³ Page 4.11-28 of the FEIR.

⁴⁴ Page 4.11-40 of the FEIR.

14. Recreation

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X		
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?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

As identified in the FEIR, the project would have a less than significant impact on parks and recreation facilities.⁴⁵

The General Plan contains a policy requiring nine acres of parkland per every 1000 residents. The addition of 2,029 new units over the original allocation generates a parkland dedication requirement of 46 acres of citywide, neighborhood and open space park uses. The project includes the dedication of 15.5 acres of neighborhood park and 36 acres of open space. Additionally, the units will pay neighborhood and City wide park fees at issuance of a building permit. With the combination of land dedication and the payment of park fees, the potential impact to park services is considered less than significant.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR to parks, recreation and open space. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(4), the City finds that these “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] . . . were covered in the program EIR.”

⁴⁵ Page 4.11-38 of the FEIR.

15. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	X				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?			X		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X		
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X		
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project will be conditioned to provide roadway improvements within the development area, including an extension of a portion of Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Westbrook Boulevard, Santucci Boulevard, and various internal streets.

Although the cumulative traffic analysis for the SVSP, in projecting impacts for the entire SVSP and other reasonably foreseeable future development, assumed a level of development in the Urban Reserve properties similar to those assumed for other portions of the Specific Plan area,⁴⁶ the City's traffic model currently assumes no development of the site. The proposed project includes 2,029 lots, which would increase PM peak hour traffic volumes. The City improvement standards require that a long term traffic study be prepared if the increase in PM peak hour traffic volumes exceed 50 vehicles.

In order to determine whether the cumulative traffic analysis for the SVSP adequately examined the traffic impacts of the proposed project and to conduct an "Existing Plus Project" analysis for the proposed project, the City considered an expert analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers, which completed an "existing plus Westbrook Property" traffic analysis (attached hereto as Exhibit D). City staff has reviewed the Fehr and Peers analysis, and is aware that the firm has a professional reputation that makes its conclusions presumptively credible. Based on its own review of the analysis, City staff accepts the conclusions in the report.

In conducting a new "Existing Plus Project" analysis to supplement the cumulative analysis found in the Final EIR, Fehr and Peers analyzed all existing signalized intersections in the City of Roseville, along with 17 intersections, 25 roadway segments, and 12 freeway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions. The list of study facilities includes those analyzed in the SVSP FEIR plus several additional facilities.

The following summarizes the key findings of the analysis:

- The City of Roseville has established a Level of Service (LOS) policy whereby at least 70 percent of signalized intersections in the City should operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak hour. Currently, 95 percent of all signalized intersections operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak hour. The existing plus project scenario would maintain this percentage, and therefore not cause an inconsistency with this policy.
- The Westbrook Property would cause project-specific impacts at two intersections in Roseville, two intersections in Placer County, one road segment in Placer County, one intersection in Sutter County, and two Caltrans freeway facility segments. Each impact is described in the traffic report, along with a recommended mitigation measure, and resulting operations, and residual significance. Each of these impacts can either be mitigated to a less than significant level, or were previously identified as being significant and unavoidable impacts as part of the SVSP Final EIR (2010).

⁴⁶ Page 5-18 of the Final EIR.

**TABLE 8
 WESTBROOK TRIP GENERATION**

Land Use	Amount	Daily Trip Rate	Daily Trips
Single Family	1,340 DU	9	12,060
Multi-family	689 DU	6.5	4,479
Retail	457.81 ksf	35	16,023
Office	54.89ksf	17.7	972
Elementary School	750 students	1.0	750
Neighborhood Parks	15.5 acres	2.2	34
Total			34,318

The City of Roseville base year traffic model was used to estimate the directionality of external vehicle trips. Under the existing plus project scenario, project access is provided entirely from Pleasant Grove Boulevard west of Fiddymment Road.

The project would cause the following two intersections, that were not identified in the SVSP EIR, to degrade from LOS C to D during the PM peak hour in the existing plus project scenario.

1. Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road
2. Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway

As noted on page 4.3-73 of the SVSP FEIR, the City of Roseville General Plan has previously adopted findings of overriding consideration to establish LOS E as an acceptable LOS at the Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road intersection and LOS F as an acceptable LOS at the Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway intersection. Therefore, impacts to these intersections are considered less than significant. Proposed improvements as part of the SVSP project would ensure that the Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road intersection will operate at acceptable levels with the project. The Westbrook project would contribute to these improvements through fair share contributions to the CIP.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

Significant impacts of the Westbrook property were identified based on the results presented in and the thresholds of significance established in the SVSP FEIR (2010). The project would cause potentially significant impacts at the following locations, all of which were identified in the SVSP EIR:

1. Roseville: Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road (LOS C to D during the PM peak hour)
2. Roseville: Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway (LOS C to D during the PM peak hour)
3. Placer County: Locust/Baseline (LOS E to F during PM peak hour)
4. Placer County: Walerga Road/PFE Road (LOS D to E during the AM peak hour and LOS C to D during the PM peak hour)
5. Placer County: Walerga Road south of Baseline Road (LOS D to E on a daily basis)
6. Sutter County: Pleasant Grove Road South/Riego Road (LOS D to E during the PM peak hour)
7. Caltrans: I-80 from Sacramento County line to Taylor Road (LOS F conditions exacerbated)

8. Caltrans: SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard (LOS F conditions exacerbated)

Each impact is described below, followed by a mitigation measure to which the applicant has agreed.

- 1) *Development of the project would worsen operations from LOS C to D conditions during the PM peak hour at the Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road intersection.*

The addition of project traffic would worsen this intersection from LOS C (v/c 0.80) to LOS D (v/c 0.89) during the PM peak hour. This impact was previously identified in the SVSP FEIR⁴⁷. The City of Roseville General Plan has previously adopted findings of overriding consideration for this intersection to establish LOS E as an acceptable condition at 2025 market rate build out. Additional improvements planned as part of the SVSP project include widening Fiddymont Road and improving all approaches of the intersection, which would consist of dual left-turn lanes and three through lanes, which would result in LOS A conditions with the project. Consistent with mitigation measure MM 4.3-1 (*Roseville Intersections: Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP*), the Westbrook project would pay CIP fees to help fund these and other improvements⁴⁸. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- 2) *Development of the project would worsen the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Roseville Parkway from LOS C to D conditions during the PM peak hour in the City of Roseville.*

The addition of project traffic would worsen this intersection from LOS C (v/c 0.81) to LOS D (v/c 0.83) during the PM peak hour. This impact was previously identified in the SVSP FEIR⁴⁹. The City of Roseville General Plan has previously adopted findings of overriding consideration for this intersection to establish LOS F as an acceptable condition at 2025 market rate build out.

Additional improvements planned include a fourth eastbound and westbound through lane and a third southbound through lane, which would result in LOS C conditions with the project. Consistent with MM 4.3-1, the Westbrook project will be paying CIP fees to help fund these and other improvements⁵⁰. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

- 3) *Development of the project would cause operations at the Baseline Road/Locust Road intersection in Placer County to worsen from LOS E to F during the PM peak hour.*

This all-way stop-control intersection would worsen from LOS E to F with the addition of project traffic. This impact is considered significant and was identified in the FEIR⁵¹.

⁴⁷ Page 4.4-73 and 4.3-75 of the FEIR.

⁴⁸ Page 4.4-178 of the FEIR.

⁴⁹ Page 4.4-73 of the FEIR.

⁵⁰ Page 4.3-178 of the FEIR.

⁵¹ Page 4.3-83 of the FEIR.

Construction of exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes would improve the operation of this intersection to LOS B. The City of Roseville currently participates in a joint fee program with Placer County for improvements along Baseline Road, including the construction of this improvement. Development within the Westbrook Property will be required to participate in this fee program and pay fair share costs for this improvement⁵². As such, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

- 4) *Development of the project would cause unacceptable conditions during the AM and PM peak hours at the Walerga Road/PFE Road intersection in Placer County*⁵³.

The addition of project traffic would worsen this intersection from LOS C to D during the PM peak hour. Unacceptable AM peak hour operations would also be exacerbated to a significant degree. This impact is considered significant.

Construction of a second northbound and southbound through lane would improve the operation of this intersection to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS A during the PM peak hour. Currently this improvement is identified in Placer County's CIP for which fee's are being collected. The City currently participates in a joint fee program with Placer County for improvements along Walerga Road, including the construction of this improvement. Development within the Westbrook Property will be required to participate in this fee program and pay fair share costs for this improvement. As such, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

- 5) *Development of the project would cause unacceptable conditions to be degraded on Walerga Road south of Baseline Road in Placer County.*

The addition of project traffic would worsen daily conditions from LOS D to E. The v/c ratio would increase by 0.07, which exceeds the 0.05 threshold. This impact is considered significant.

The widening of this facility to four continuous lanes would improve the operation of this segment to LOS A. Currently this improvement is identified in Placer County's CIP, for which fees are being collected. As a condition of approval, the Westbrook Project will be obligated to pay its fair share costs to the County. As such, this impact would be reduced to less than significant. However, the City/County fee program does not currently include widening of this segment to four continuous lanes. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Because the SVSP FEIR also identified this impact to be significant and unavoidable, the Westbrook amendment would not result in any greater impacts than already analyzed in the SVSP EIR.

⁵² MM 4.3-2 (Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share of Improvements), Page 4.3-180.

⁵³ Pages 4.3-83 and 4.3-89 of the FEIR.

- 6) *Development of the project would cause operations to worsen during the PM peak hour at the Pleasant Grove Road South/Riego Road intersection in Sutter County*⁵⁴.

The addition of project traffic would worsen PM peak hour conditions from LOS D to LOS E. It should be noted that delay levels at this intersection are currently at the LOS D/E cusp, meaning that even a marginal increase in traffic would likely cause a LOS degradation. Nevertheless, this impact is considered significant.

Construction of an additional eastbound through lane would improve the operation of this intersection to LOS B, which meets the County's LOS policy. However, the City of Roseville does not have control over improvements on Sutter County roadways. The City previously concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable, and prepared a statement of overriding considerations for this impact. As identified in the EIR⁵⁵, MM 4.3-7 (*Sutter County Facilities*), the City is committed to and will initiate contact with Sutter County officials to explore the feasibility of developing a joint fee program, wherein the effects of development across jurisdictional boundaries are addressed. If adopted, the Westbrook property will be made part of such a fee program. Therefore, this impact is not greater than previously analyzed in the SVSP EIR.

- 7) *Development of the proposed project would add traffic to I-80 between the Sacramento County Line and Taylor Road, which currently operates unacceptably*⁵⁶.

The project would add between 400 and 700 vehicles per day to various segments along this freeway. This increase would represent between 0.2 and 0.4 percent of the total amount of traffic already using this facility. Since Caltrans deems any additional traffic to a segment operating unacceptably to be a significant impact, the City has chosen to defer to Caltrans on this point and considers the impact to be significant.

Improvements have recently been made and additional improvements are currently under construction in this segment of I-80 to add HOV lanes and auxiliary lanes between interchanges. Because the City of Roseville does not have control over the timing, type, and effectiveness of improvements on State facilities, it previously concluded that the SVSP (including its Urban Reserve parcels) would cause a significant and unavoidable impact on this segment of I-80. The City prepared a statement of overriding considerations for the SVSP impact. Consistent with Mitigation Measure MM 4.3-6 (*State Facility Segments*),⁵⁷ the City is committed to working with Caltrans and other agencies in south Placer County to pursue funding for construction of additional improvements to I-80. The Westbrook development would be required to pay its fair share to such a fee program. This impact is not greater than previously identified in the SVSP FEIR.

⁵⁴ Page 4.3-98 of the FEIR.

⁵⁵ MM 4.3-7, page 4.3-185 of the FEIR.

⁵⁶ Page 4.3-105 of the FEIR.

⁵⁷ Page 4.3-184 of the FEIR.

- 8) *Development of the proposed project would add traffic to SR 65 between I-80 and Blue Oaks Boulevard, which currently operates unacceptably.*

The project would add between 100 and 900 vehicles per day to various segments of this freeway. This represents between 0.1 and 0.8 percent of the amount of traffic currently using this facility. Since Caltrans deems any additional traffic to a segment operating unacceptably to be a significant impact, the City has chosen to defer to Caltrans on this point and considers the impact to be significant.

Because the City of Roseville does not have control over the timing, type, and effectiveness of improvements on State facilities, it previously concluded that the SVSP (including its Urban Reserve parcels) would cause a significant and unavoidable impact on this segment of SR 65. The City prepared a statement of overriding considerations for this impact. It is worth noting that the City imposes several impact fees on new development to help fund regional improvements including SR 65 capacity expansions. These include South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) and Highway 65 JPA fees. The Westbrook development would be required to participate in such fees to fund its fair share of improvements. This impact is not greater than was previously identified in the SVSP FEIR.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions; and, while new “Existing plus Project” impacts are identified in conjunction with the proposed project, mitigation has been identified that will be included in the project to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

PROJECT IMPACTS UNDER CUMULATIVE 2025 CIP CONDITIONS

Fehr and Peers analyzed the impacts of the Westbrook Property under cumulative 2025 CIP conditions at all existing and future signalized intersections in the City of Roseville. In addition, impacts were analyzed at intersections, roadways, and freeway facilities in adjacent jurisdictions. The analysis considered various approved, pending, and reasonableness land use assumptions along with planned roadway improvements. The following discussion summarizes the results of this analysis:

- Under cumulative “no project” conditions, 90 percent of signalized intersections in the City of Roseville during the AM peak hour and 80 percent of intersections during the PM peak hour would operate at LOS C or better. These percentages exceed the Citywide 70 percent LOS C threshold. The addition of project traffic would not change these percentages. Therefore, the project would maintain the City’s 70 percent LOS threshold.
- The project would cause significant impacts at three signalized intersections in Roseville- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Diamond Creek, Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway and Industrial Avenue/Alantown Drive. As shown in the traffic study, each impact can be mitigated per Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 found in the SVSP EIR- Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP, and will reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Applicant has agreed to this mitigation, and as part of this project, the City will update the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to include modified intersection lane assignments and striping per the Westbrook Amendment traffic analysis.

- 9) *Development of the project would worsen operations from LOS C to D conditions during the PM peak hour at the Blue Oaks Boulevard/Diamond Creek intersection.*

The addition of project traffic would worsen this intersection from LOS E (v/c 0.99) to LOS F (v/c 1.01) during the PM peak hour. This impact is considered significant.

The northbound through lane will be restriped to a shared left/through lane. This modification can be accomplished within available right-of-way. With this improvement operations are improved to LOS E (V/C 0.97) with implementation of MM 4.3-1 (*Pay Fair Share of CIP Improvements*). The applicant has agreed to participate in this improvement through the payment of CIP fees to fund this improvement. Therefore, this mitigation would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

- 10) *Development of the project would worsen the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Roseville Parkway from LOS E to F conditions during the PM peak hour in the City of Roseville.*

The addition of project traffic would worsen this intersection from LOS E (v/c 1.00) to LOS F (v/c 1.05) during the PM peak hour. This impact was previously identified in the SVSP FEIR⁵⁸. The City of Roseville General Plan has previously adopted findings of overriding consideration for this intersection to establish LOS F as an acceptable condition at 2025 market rate build out.

Additional improvements planned include a fourth eastbound and westbound through lane and a third southbound through lane, which would result in LOS C conditions with the project. Consistent with MM 4.3-1, the Westbrook project will be paying CIP fees to help fund these and other improvements. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

- 11) *Development of the project would cause operations at the Industrial Avenue/Alantown Drive to degrade from LOS C (V/C 0.81) to LOS D (V/C 0.82) during the PM peak hour⁵⁹.*

At the time the FEIR was prepared, the document identified impacts to this intersection as significant and unavoidable. However, the traffic consultant, Fehr and Peers, in analyzing the Westbrook project determined that feasible mitigation is available. The addition of a westbound right-turn overlap arrow would improve operations to LOS C with the project. Therefore, with mitigation this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level, which is a lesser impact than identified in the FEIR. The Westbrook project will be required to pay CIP to help fund this and other improvements in the City.

⁵⁸ Page 4.3-132 of the FEIR.

⁵⁹ Page 4.3-141 of the FEIR.

12) *Development of the project would add traffic to already degraded freeway segment operating at LOS E or F under 2025 CIP conditions.*

Improvements have recently been made and additional improvements are currently under construction in this segment of I-80 to add HOV lanes and auxiliary lanes between interchanges. Because the City of Roseville does not have control over the timing, type, and effectiveness of improvements on State facilities, the City previously concluded that the SVSP (including its Urban Reserve parcels) would cause a significant and unavoidable impact on this segment of I-80⁶⁰. The City prepared a statement of overriding considerations for the SVSP impact. Consistent with Mitigation Measure MM 4.3-6 (*State Facilities*), the City is committed to working with Caltrans and other agencies in south Placer County to pursue funding for construction of additional improvements to I-80. The Westbrook development would be required to pay its fair share to such a fee program. This impact is consistent with the impacts previously identified in the SVSP FEIR.

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and the cumulative traffic analysis prepared for the SVSP. Because Fehr and Peers analysis has verified that the proposed project will not result in any significant traffic impacts more severe than those disclosed in the SVSP EIR, the City finds pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (C)(4), that these cumulative “environmental effects of the [site-specific project] were covered in the program EIR.”

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant			X		

⁶⁰ Page 4.3-165 of the FEIR.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environmental effects?					
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?			X		
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

Water Supply

The SVSP Final EIR determined that Urban Reserve water demands would be approximately 1,141 acre feet per year (“afy”)⁶¹. Based on project specific studies, water demand for Westbrook – without any conservation achieved through mitigation -- would be approximately 1,112 afy, just slightly more than identified in the FEIR. The Water Supply Assessment (WSA) can be found as Attachment F to this Initial Study.

⁶¹ Page 4.12-49 of the FEIR.

TABLE 9
WATER USE FACTORS AND DEMANDS

Land Use Designation	Abbreviation	Annual Demand	Conservation Demand AFY	Recycled Water AFY	Surface Water AFY
Residential					
Low Density Residential	LDR	425	76	0	349
Medium Density Residential	MDR	262	48	0	214
High Density Residential	HDR	137	14	10	113
Non-Residential					
Commercial Mixed Use	CC (CMU)	18	0	3	15
Community Commercial	CC	106	0	18	88
Park	PR	52	12	33	7
Elementary School	P/QP	39	0	14	25
Well Site	P/QP	1	0	1	0
Lift Station	P/QP	1	0	1	0
Open Space	OS	0	0	0	0
Landscape Corridor	LC	49	28	21	0
Total		1,112	178	101	833

1. Memo From Derrick Whitehead, Director of Environmental Utilities, February 2012.

2. Annual demand based on the Westbrook land use plan, updated August 1, 2011 and includes 2% for losses.

Consistent with SBx7, the state requirement to conserve 20% of water supply by the year 2020, the City requires that the project include a water conservation plan. In order to be consistent with SBx7 as well as the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. If the described water conservation measures were for Westbrook are implemented (estimated 178 AFY reduction) and if recycled water is used by the project (estimate 101 AFY reduction), it is estimated that Westbrook overall water demand would be reduced by 289 AFY, yielding an adjusted water demand of 833 AFY. The SVSP EIR disclosed that there was a potential shortfall in water supply available to serve the Urban Reserve area; therefore a new source of supply would be required to develop the Urban Reserve area. As shown in Table 7, Water Use Factors and Demand, above, the Westbrook Specific Plan Amendment would require 811 acre feet per year of surface water supply assuming water conservation and use of recycled water. The City currently has 566 acre feet of available surface water supply that could be used to serve a portion of the project demand, leaving 267 acre feet of supply that remains to be filled.

The City has 313 AFY of unentitled water supplies that have been set aside for potential future corporate business centers. These unentitled supplies were set aside for the City to use when working with potential businesses that may be interested in locating in Roseville. The purpose of this reserve is to augment long-term water if the potential business requires more water than what is typically allocated for the corporate center parcel being considered for development. No corporate centers are currently proposed and none are entitled. Therefore, this water is available for use at the City's discretion. It is proposed that 267 acre feet of corporate center water be allocated to the Westbrook project. Approximately 46 acre feet would still be available should a corporate center project be proposed in the future.

According to the Water Supply Assessment (see page 43), the City of Roseville's total projected water supplies for normal, single-dry and multiple-dry years over a 20-year buildout scenario are adequate to meet the projected water demands of the Westbrook project. This is in addition to meeting the existing service area's planned future demand. Because adequate existing water supplies are available to serve the project, this is a less than significant impact. This is less than the impact identified in the Final EIR, which had identified the short fall as significant and unavoidable (page 4.12.1-47 of the FEIR).

Recycled Water

The Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF) of treated wastewater from Westbrook is estimated to be approximately 0.392 MGD (MacKay and Soms, 2011). The Westbrook peak month recycled water demand, including water conservation, is estimated to be 0.268 MGD. Therefore, since the ADWF of recycled water exceeds the peak day recycled water demand, no supplemental water supply source is required for Westbrook.

Recycled Water Distribution

The Westbrook recycled water distribution system pipeline alignment is a looped system. The main supply pipeline alignment travels north- south through the property from the WRSP system to the SVSP system within the planned extension of Westbrook Boulevard. Another smaller pipeline would travel north-south through the property, connecting the northern most parcel with the SVSP along Santucci Boulevard. The two main east west alignments are located in Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Mountain Glen Drive respectively. Multiple laterals from the main loop alignments would extend along roadways to serve customers outside of the primary loops.

Storage Tank and Pump System

When including the proposed Westbrook water conservation measures, detailed in the Westbrook Water Conservation Plan (Attachment 2 of the Water Supply Assessment included with this Initial Study. The overall recycled water demand for Westbrook is one acre foot a year (AFY) less than the recycled water demand proposed for this area in the SVSP Recycled Water Master Plan and SVSP FEIR. Due to the fact that this decrease in recycled water demand is relatively small, no changes to the WRSP storage tank and pump station expansion plans detailed in the SVSP Recycled Water Master Plan are anticipated. Therefore the planned size of the WRSP storage tank and pump station is appropriate to serve the needs of the WRSP, the WRSP connection to the North Zone, SVSP, and Westbrook.

TABLE 10

MINIMUM TANK SPECIFICATIONS

Parameter	SVSP Base plus Westbrook
Tank Diameter	98 feet
Tank Height (Maximum Level)	32 feet
Minimum Tank Level	5.0 feet
Nominal Tank Volume	1.82 MG

Notes:

1. These dimensions provide the minimum storage requirement of one peak day of flow and flow assumptions for this scenario with a 20% factor of safety.

The Westbrook project will be required to fund its fair share of the following improvements as part of the project:

- **Construct a new recycled water storage tank:** The 1.82 MG tank planned in the SVSP Recycled Water Master Plan is adequate to provide recycled water storage for the SVSP and Westbrook. A total of 0.268 MG of this storage is required for Westbrook. The new recycled water storage tank will be located adjacent to the existing WRSP storage tanks and pump station site.
- **Upgrade the existing WRSP recycled water pump station:** The upgraded WRSP pump station will need to have the ability to pump recycled water to the WRSP, the WRSP connection to the North Zone, SVSP, and Westbrook. The WRSP recycled water pump station must have a pumping capacity of 12,000 gpm with a TDH of 215 ft to supply the complete WRSP/SVSP/Westbrook recycled water distribution system.

Wastewater

The Westbrook project would generate approximately 0.392 million gallons a day average dry weather flow as estimated by MacKay & Soms Civil Engineers, Inc.⁶². This is consistent with the analysis found in the FEIR.⁶³ The Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant was sized to accommodate flow from the Urban Reserve area and was evaluated in the West Roseville Specific Plan Final EIR in 2004.⁶⁴

The proposed uses are substantially consistent with the buildout assumptions and would not increase the severity of already identified impacts; therefore, there would be no new impacts to utilities not previously identified in the SVSP Final EIR. Thus, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c), (4), that these “environmental effects of the [site specific project]... were covered in the program EIR.

Solid Waste

Solid waste generated within the Westbrook area of the SVSP would be recycled or disposed at the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA) facilities as are current City practices. The project is expected to generate 11,305 tons per year (31 tons per day) of solid waste, all of which will be to be processed at the WPWMA Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). The analysis of the Westbrook area within the SVSP Final EIR assumed a generation of 13,858 tons per year and concludes that in combination with buildout of the City’s General Plan area, the MRF has sufficient capacity to service the project. It further concludes that the life of the landfill will be slightly reduced and with mitigation the impact would be significant and unavoidable, because although the landfill capacity could be increased it is outside the jurisdiction of the City of Roseville. This is consistent with the conclusions in the Final EIR⁶⁵.

⁶² Westbrook Property, a Portion of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Sanitary Sewer Master Plan, August 24, 2011.

⁶³ Page 4.12.3-15 of the FEIR.

⁶⁴ Page 4.11-66 of the West Plan Final EIR.

⁶⁵ Page 4.12.4-13 of the FEIR.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Impact for which SVSP EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant	No Impact
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, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X		
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).			X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The FEIR determined there would be significant cumulative traffic impacts to Roseville, Placer County, Sutter County and Sacramento County with and without Placer Parkway.⁶⁶ Buildout of the project is consistent with the development assumptions in the FEIR.

⁶⁶ Pages 5.11-128 of the FEIR.

The FEIR determined there would be significant cumulative air quality impacts related to construction emissions and operational emissions.⁶⁷ As describe previously greenhouse gas is cumulative in nature, and was determined to be a significant unavoidable impact in the SVSP EIR.

The FEIR determined there would be less than significant cumulative impacts from noise generated by construction activities and stationary source noise associated with ongoing operation.⁶⁸ However on and off-site traffic noise was determined to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.⁶⁹

The FEIR determined that development of the site for urban uses would have a significant cumulative impact on the loss of vernal pool wetlands and rare plant species⁷⁰.

The FEIR determined that if cultural or paleontological resources are discovered during construction, it would result in potential significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.⁷¹

The FEIR determined that because cumulative development could require the treatment of water from additional sources that are at present un-assured and unfunded, the construction of which, would result in significant unavoidable impacts, the construction of water delivery infrastructure and potable water treatment for the Urban Reserve lands was conservatively considered to be cumulatively considerable and thus significant.⁷² However, as identified in Section 16, no new source and supply of water will be required to serve the project. Therefore, cumulative impacts on water supply would not be as severe as identified in the FEIR, and the contribution of the proposed project to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable and less than significant.

The FEIR determined that construction of additional recycled water facilities could accommodate growth which could result in indirect effects (traffic, air quality, loss of habitat and noise) which is considered significant and unavoidable⁷³ The proposed project is within the level of growth analyzed in the FEIR.

The FEIR determined that the construction of new wastewater facilities where such facilities do not exist, could result in potentially significant environmental effects, in part related to construction activities. The construction of additional wastewater facilities could accommodate growth which could result in indirect effects (traffic, air quality, loss of habitat and noise) which is considered significant and unavoidable⁷⁴ The proposed project is within the level of growth analyzed in the FEIR.

The FEIR determined that the project's cumulative contribution to solid waste capacity was significant and unavoidable. Solid waste from the project in combination with other cumulative development would shorten the lifespan of the material recycling facility and the landfill. As a result, both facilities would need to be expanded to create additional capacity or waste would need to be transported elsewhere.

⁶⁷ Pages 5-129 and 5-130 of the FEIR.

⁶⁸ Page 5-131 and 5-132 of the FEIR.

⁶⁹ Page 5-133 of the FEIR.

⁷⁰ Page 5-136 of the FEIR.

⁷¹ Page 5-137 of the FEIR.

⁷² Page 5-153 of the FEIR.

⁷³ Page 5-166 of the FEIR.

⁷⁴ Page 5-166 of the FEIR.

The project's incremental contribution to cumulative solid waste demand is considered significant and unavoidable.⁷⁵

The FEIR determined that the conversion of grassland to urban development in the region is likely to continue, which would significantly alter the visual character of area. This is considered a significant and unavoidable cumulative aesthetic impact to which the project would contribute.⁷⁶ The FEIR determined that that the construction of new natural gas transmission facilities for development in the SVSP area, including the Urban Reserve, could result in indirect growth effects (loss of habitat, traffic, air and noise) which could be significant and unavoidable⁷⁷.

All other impacts analyzed in the SVSP EIR were determined to be less than significant (land use, public services, electric demand, etc.). There would be no new significant impacts in these resource areas due to the proposed project. The City of Roseville has determined that cumulative impacts, including the proposed project are not substantially more severe than what was disclosed in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan FEIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

As shown in the checklist prepared as part of this Initial Study, City staff has not identified any significant impacts of the proposed project, whether onsite, offsite or cumulative in nature, that were not already adequately examined in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR. Any environmental effects of the proposed project not adequately examined in the prior EIR are either less than significant or will be less than significant after mitigation agreed to by the applicant. These determinations are based on a review of the SVSP EIR and project specific studies prepared either to verify the adequacy of the EIR analysis or to provide new analysis on issues not adequately examined in the SVSP EIR. City staff has also determined through review of these documents that the Westbrook amendment to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan is compliant with the mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

[X] I find that the proposed project with mitigation WOULD NOT have a greater significant effect on the environment than identified in the SVSP FEIR and a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Initial Study Prepared by:



Kathy Pease, Senior Planner
City of Roseville, Planning Department

⁷⁵ Page 5-167 of the FEIR.

⁷⁶ Page 5-175 of the FEIR.