

# **APPENDIX B**

---

---

**INITIAL STUDY**

## INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

<b>Project Title/File Number</b>	Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan
<b>Project Location</b>	Unincorporated Placer County, immediately north of the City of Roseville's existing City limits.
<b>Project Description</b>	The Proposed Project includes the annexation of the entire 694.4-acre project site into the City of Roseville and adoption of the proposed Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, which would allow for the development of 2,906 dwelling units consisting of a mix of low-, medium-, and high-density residential uses; community commercial uses; public/quasi-public uses; parks and recreation areas; open space; paseos; urban reserve area; roadways; and offsite drainage and grading improvements.
<b>Project Applicant</b>	Brookfield Residential Properties John Norman, Vice President
<b>Lead Agency Contact Person</b>	Kathy Pease, Planning Manager Development Services – Planning Division 311 Vernon Street Roseville, CA 95678 (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 previous environmental documents (see Attachments) and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCD 15000 et seq.).

In reviewing the information provided for this project, the City of Roseville Public Works Department has Analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that at least one impact is considered to be potentially significant. Therefore, on the basis of the following initial evaluation, we find that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an Environmental Impact Report will be required. As documented in this Initial Study, impacts in many resource areas will be less than significant, and the EIR will be focused on those areas where potentially significant impacts may occur.

## I. SETTING

The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP or Proposed Project) site (project site) consists of approximately 694.4 acres located in unincorporated Placer County (County), immediately north of the City of Roseville's existing City limits (see Figure 2-1, Regional Location and Development Map). The project site is directly north of the approved Creekview Specific Plan (CSP) and directly east of the City's Al Johnson Wildlife Area (a.k.a Reason Farms) in the "Pleasant Grove, CA" U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle, Township 11 North (T11N) Range 5 East (R5E), and Sections 11 and 14, Mt. Diablo Baseline and Meridian.

The proposed ARSP land use plan consists of low, medium, and high density residential uses; community commercial uses; public/quasi-public uses; parks and recreation areas; open space; paseos, urban reserve area; and roadways. **Table 1** provides a breakdown of the proposed land uses within the project site, including proposed General Plan and zoning designations, acreages, and residential units by category. At buildout, the Proposed Project would provide approximately 2,827 dwelling units, housing a population of approximately 7,379 persons, based on the City's General Plan assumption of 2.61 persons per household. The ARSP could add as much as approximately 476,000 square feet of commercial and retail and office uses.

**TABLE 1**  
LAND USE SUMMARY

General Plan Land Use Designation / Description		Applied Zoning Districts <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Units
<b>Residential Neighborhoods</b>				
LDR	Low Density Residential	R1 and RS/DS	248.8	1,302
MDR	Medium Density Residential	RS/DS	50.3	542
HDR	High Density Residential	R3	38.1	873
Subtotal			337.2	2,717
<b>Commercial</b>				
CC	Community Commercial - Village District	CMU-SA	27.3	109
CC	Community Commercial	CC	23.9	
Subtotal			51.2	109
<b>Parks and Open Space</b>				
OS	General Open Space	OS	145.5	
	P/R Parks & Recreation	PR	22.1	
Subtotal			167.7	
<b>Public/Quasi Public</b>				
P/QP	Elementary School	P/QP	9.6	
P/QP	Fire Station and Utility Sites	P/QP	7.6	
Subtotal			17.2	
<b>Other</b>				
UR	Urban Reserve	UR	20.0	1
ROW	Roadway Right of Way		52.0	
	NAPOTS		49.2	
Subtotal			121.2	1
<b>Overall Totals</b>			<b>694.4</b>	<b>2,827</b>
1 - The zoning districts are defined in the City's Zoning Ordinance that can be viewed at the Civic Center Permit Center or online at <a href="http://www.roseville.ca.us">www.roseville.ca.us</a> .				

## II. PREVIOUS STUDIES/REPORTS

The following documents that relate to the project have been prepared and are available for review at the Roseville Permit Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 during normal business hours:

- City of Roseville General Plan (as amended August 2014)
- West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) EIR (February 2004)
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) EIR (May 2010)
- Creekview Specific Plan (CSP) EIR (April 2011)

## III. CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATING ORDINANCES, GUIDELINES, AND STANDARDS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows the use of uniformly applied, previously adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects of future projects when those standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines §15183(f)). The City's Zoning Ordinance, Noise Ordinance, Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Construction Standards, Improvement Standards, Tree Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and Community and Specific Plan Design Guidelines include standards and policies that are uniformly applied to development projects throughout the City. In March 2003, the City of Roseville adopted Findings of Fact confirming that certain environmental impacts for the following issue areas are mitigated by the uniform application of the above ordinances, guidelines, and standards (Resolution 03-169):

- Flooding
- Urban Form/Aesthetics
- Tree Impacts
- Cultural Resources Impacts
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Water Quality
- Drainage
- Traffic

The City's mitigating ordinances, guidelines and standards are referenced, where applicable, in this Initial Study Checklist. Because the City of Roseville has adopted CEQA Findings that these Mitigating Policies and Standards substantially mitigate environmental impacts, no additional project-specific mitigation is required for the specified impact areas.

## IV. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The initial study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the Proposed Project on the environment. Environmental issues identified in the checklist are followed by a discussion that includes recommended mitigation measures.

1. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
2. "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.
3. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" 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.
4. "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.
5. Earlier Analysis 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).
6. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page(s) or section(s) where the statement is substantiated.

<b><u>AESTHETICS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A, B, C, and D

The Proposed Project would result in the development of residences, school(s), and associated infrastructure on approximately 694.4 acres of semi-rural agricultural land. Development within this area would change scenic resources and scenic vistas. Development of the Proposed Project would also significantly alter the visual character of the site. Additionally, the project would create a new source of light and glare. These issues will be addressed in the Aesthetics section of the EIR.

<b><u>AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:</p>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Questions A, B, and E**

Approximately 103 acres within the project site is irrigated pasture, and an additional 533 acres of grassland provide seasonal rangeland for cattle for a total of 636 acres of agricultural land within the project site. No land within the project site is under a Williamson Act Contract. A complete analysis of impacts to agricultural resources will be included in the Land Use and Agricultural Resources section of the EIR.

### **Questions C and D**

There is no forest land located on the Project site and therefore there would be no impacts to forestry resources. Further analysis of this issue is not required.

<b><u>AIR QUALITY</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where applicable, 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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-E

Construction activities and related traffic would result in air quality emissions that may exceed established standards. Sensitive receptors may be impacted and objectionable odors may be created. A complete analysis of impacts to air quality will be included in the Air Quality section of the EIR.

<b><u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or USFWS?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native residents or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-F

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in potential habitat loss, and impacts to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife corridors. There is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan that applies to the Project Area. The County is currently preparing the

Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP), but this plan is in draft form and has not been adopted. However, the PCCP is discussed further in the EIR. All impacts to biological resources will be addressed in the Vegetation and Wildlife section of the EIR.

<b><u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-B and D-E

During site construction, there is the potential to uncover significant cultural resources. Impacts to cultural resources will be addressed in the EIR.

### Question C

During site construction, there is the potential to impact unique paleontological resources. Impacts to paleontological resources will be addressed in the EIR. The project site is relatively flat, with gently rolling terrain generally trending to the west and south. The project site does not contain unique geologic features and therefore there would be no impacts to such features. Further analysis of this issue is not required.

<b><u>GEOLOGY &amp; SOILS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A, B, and D

Potential impacts associated with seismic hazards, soil erosion, and expansive soils will be addressed within the Geological, Soils, and Seismicity section of the EIR.

### Questions C

The site is not located within an area susceptible to landslides or slope instability. Further analysis of this issue is not required.

<b><u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Questions A and B**

Construction and increased vehicle use associated with the Proposed Project could result in potentially significant impacts. Potential impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions will be addressed within the Climate Change, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions section of the EIR.

<b><u>HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handles hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Questions A-C, and H**

The Proposed Project and related projects would all involve the storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials to varying degrees during construction and operation. Impacts relating to hazards (including wildland fires) and hazardous materials, as well as interference with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans could occur during construction or operation of the Proposed Project. An analysis of impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials and emergency response or evacuation plans will be included in the Hazardous Materials and Public Safety section of the EIR. An analysis of impacts associated with wildland fires will be included in the Public Services section of the EIR.

### **Questions D-F and G**

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Operation of the Proposed Project would not emit hazardous materials nor result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport as the project site is not located within two miles of either. These effects are therefore not considered within the EIR and further analysis of these issues is not required.

<b><u>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b><u>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-I

Implementation of the Proposed Project would introduce impervious surfaces and alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site. Construction activities and operation on the project would create the potential to impact water quality. Impacts associated with hydrology and water quality will be analyzed within the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the EIR.

### Questions J

The project site is not located near a water body or other feature that would pose potential impacts from tsunamis, seiches, and mudflows. These effects are therefore not considered within the EIR and further analysis of this issue is not required.

<b><u>LAND USE &amp; PLANNING</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Question A

The Proposed Project would not divide an established community. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

### Question B

Consistency with local planning documents and compatibility with surrounding land uses will be discussed in the Land Use and Agriculture section of the EIR.

### Question C

Although there is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan that applies to the Project Area, the PCCP is discussed further in the Vegetation and Wildlife section of the EIR.

<b><u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Question A**

According to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Mineral Resources Data System (MRDS) there are no known mineral resources within the project site (USGS, 2014). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not 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. Additionally, the Placer County General Plan fails to delineate any mineral resource recovery sites within the project site and as such, the project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. These issues will not be discussed in the EIR and further analysis of these issues is not required.

<b><u>NOISE</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-D

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project may result in significant temporary and long-term increases in noise. These impacts will be addressed in the Noise section of the EIR.

### Questions D-F

Construction of the Proposed Project may generate minimal groundborne vibration and groundborne noise in the vicinity of the project site. Construction will be temporary and short-term, and the Proposed Project would not be a significant source of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The project site

is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. Therefore the Proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

<b><u>POPULATION</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Question A-C**

The Proposed Project would result in the construction of 2,827 new residential unities that could result in substantial population growth to the area. Implementation of the Proposed Project would require abandonment and demolition of one existing residence. These impacts will be addressed in the Population and Housing section of the EIR.

<b><u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Question A-E**

Development of the Proposed Project has the potential to increase the demand for public services, including law enforcement, fire protection, schools, and parks. These impacts will be addressed in the Public Services section of the EIR.

<b><u>RECREATION</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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 substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A and B

Development of the project has the potential to increase the use of existing recreational facilities. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes the development of new recreational facilities within the project site. These impacts will be addressed in the Public Services section of the EIR.

<b><u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-B, and F

The Proposed Project would increase traffic both during construction and as a result of the construction of homes, which may result in congestion and decreased levels of service. The Proposed Project may affect public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. These issues will be addressed in the Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR.

## Questions C-E

The Proposed Project is not located near an airport or private airstrip and would not impact air traffic patterns since it is located approximately eight miles from the nearest airport and is outside any height restrictions for development. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Street design within the ARSP would be accomplished in accordance with State and local design standards. The adequacy of emergency service access would also comply with State and local design standards and would be reviewed as a part of the approval process of the project's detail plans to ensure compliance. Further analysis of these issue areas is not required.

<b><u>UTILITIES &amp; SERVICE SYSTEMS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Questions A-G

The Proposed Project has the potential to impact storm water run-off and drainage, the demand for water supply infrastructure, the demands on wastewater treatment, and the demands related to solid waste disposal. These impacts will be addressed in the Public Utilities section of the EIR.

<b><u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that 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 probably future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environment effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Questions A-C**

The Proposed Project has the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, would generate impacts that may be cumulatively considerable, and may have a substantial effect on human beings. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

## V. REFERENCES

- City of Roseville. 2004b. *West Roseville Specific Plan Final EIR*. Available online at: [http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development\\_services/planning/specific\\_plans\\_n\\_planning\\_areas/west\\_roseville\\_specific\\_plan.asp](http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/specific_plans_n_planning_areas/west_roseville_specific_plan.asp). Accessed December 2014.
- City of Roseville. 2010c. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final EIR*. Available online at: [http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development\\_services/planning/specific\\_plans\\_n\\_planning\\_areas/sierra\\_vista\\_specific\\_plan.asp](http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/specific_plans_n_planning_areas/sierra_vista_specific_plan.asp). Accessed December 2014.
- City of Roseville. 2011a. *Creekview Specific Plan Final EIR*. Dated April 2011. Available online at: [http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development\\_services/planning/specific\\_plans\\_n\\_planning\\_areas/creekview\\_specific\\_plan.asp](http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/specific_plans_n_planning_areas/creekview_specific_plan.asp). Accessed in December 2014.
- City of Roseville. 2014a. *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*, as amended August 2014. Available online at: [http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development\\_services/planning/general\\_plan\\_n\\_development\\_guidelines.asp](http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/general_plan_n_development_guidelines.asp). Accessed December 2014.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS), 2014. Mineral Resources Data System. Available online at: <http://mrdata.usgs.gov/mineral-resources/mrds-us.html>. Accessed December 2014.