CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

for the

AMORUSO RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN

June 15, 2016

1. INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the findings of fact (Findings) and associated statement of overriding considerations (SOC) for the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan ("ARSP" or "Proposed Project"). The Findings have been prepared pursuant to the requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21081(a) and State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Guidelines) Section 15091, and the SOC has been prepared pursuant to PRC Section 21081(b) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the City of Roseville ("City") circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) through the State Clearinghouse, to the public, local, state, and federal agencies and other known interested parties to solicit written comments concerning the Proposed Project from October 30, 2013 through December 2, 2013.

On March 1, 2016, the City released the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for public review and comment. The comment period closed on April 15, 2016. The DEIR/DEIS evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and four alternatives: No Project/No Build Alternative, Reduced Density, Similar Development Footprint Alternative, Compact Development Footprint Alternative, and Minimum Wetland Impact Alternative. A public workshop was held at Roseville City Council Chambers on March 10, 2016 and public hearings to receive public input on the DEIR were held at Roseville City Council Chambers as follows:

March 15, 2016	Transportation Commission
March 17, 2016	Design Committee
March 22, 2016	Public Utilities Commission
April 11, 2016	Parks and Recreation Commission
April 14, 2016	Planning Commission

The public hearings were recorded and archived videos of these meetings (with the exception of the Design Committee meeting) are available. Written comments were received from state, regional and local agencies, and from a few individuals; comments were also received during the public hearing(s). The City considered all of the substantive comments received on the DEIR.

The Final EIR ("FEIR) was published on May 24, 2016, and consists of the DEIR and associated appendices and the comments, responses to comments, and revisions to the DEIR. On June 15, 2016, the Roseville City Council held a public meeting to consider certification of the EIR and to decide whether or not to approve the Proposed Project or another alternative, at which time the public and interested agencies and organizations were invited to comment on the project.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

2.1. Proposed Project

Brookfield Residential, the project applicant, is seeking adoption by the City of the proposed ARSP, Sphere of Influence Amendment, Annexation, General Plan Amendment, Rezone (Pre-Zone), and Development Agreements. The proposed ARSP would result in the development of a mix of uses, including 2,827 dwelling units within the project site. Land uses include a total of approximately 134.8 acres set aside permanently for open space; 10.7 acres of paseo open space; 22.1 acres of parks; 17.2 acres of public/quasi-public uses (elementary school, fire station, sewer lift stations, and well site); 337.2 acres of low, medium, and high density residential (LDR, MDR, and HDR, respectively); a 27.3-acre Village District (mixed commercial, office, residential); and 23.9 acres of community commercial. Within the project site, approximately 101 acres would be used for roadway and transportation facilities, including a right-of-way dedication of approximately 49.2 acres for the future Placer Parkway Regional Transportation Improvement project (Placer Parkway) which is not part of the Proposed Project (Not a Part of this Project [NAPOTS]). Placer Parkway, although located within the overall project site, is a separate project anticipated to be further planned by the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority.

The project site consists of four parcels, which are County Assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) 017-020-016-510, 017-020-017-510, 017-010-054-000, and 017-010-010-000. APN 017-010-010-000 is the Wagner Parcel, which is designated as Urban Reserve because it is not a participating property, and no development is proposed on the parcel at this time. The remaining parcels are considered the Development Area.

The EIR evaluates the effects of annexing the Urban Reserve parcel at a programmatic level. For the purpose of this EIR, it is assumed that rural agricultural uses would continue, and that a single residential unit may be established as allowable under the Urban Reserve land use designation of the City's General Plan. If development is proposed in the future, it would require general plan and specific plan amendments, additional environmental review, and applicable approvals/permits.

2.2. Project Location

The Proposed Project, annexation and sphere of influence (SOI) amendment area (project site) consists of approximately 694.4 acres located in unincorporated Placer County, immediately north of the City of Roseville's existing City limits. The project site is directly north of the approved Creekview Specific Plan (CSP) and northeast of the City's Al Johnson Wildlife Area (a.k.a. Reason Farms) in the "Pleasant Grove, CA" United States Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle, Township 11 North (T11N) Range 5 East (R5E), and Sections 11 and 14, Mt. Diablo Baseline and Meridian.

The project site is located approximately 6.5 miles west of Interstate 80 and State Route (SR) 65, approximately 9.8 miles northeast of the City of Sacramento, 8 miles east of SR 99, 5 miles northwest of downtown Roseville, and 4 miles east of the Sutter County Line. The project site is

currently accessed from West Sunset Boulevard, an unincorporated County road that runs west/east along the northern border of the site. Proposed access to the project site would be to/from the south, via an extension of Blue Oak Boulevard west, and Westbrook Boulevard north, through the CSP area. Access would also be provided to/from the north via two roadway connections to West Sunset Boulevard. The future year scenarios include Placer Parkway through the site, and adding two potential connections from Westbrook Boulevard into the Placer Ranch area (to/from the east).

2.3. Project Description

The Proposed Project would include a range of housing types, commercial uses, open space, and recreation opportunities, as well as support services such as roadway improvements, support infrastructure, and utilities. Land uses are described below and shown in Table 2-1 (Table 2-1 of the DEIR).

DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

Project approval requires the City, as lead agency, as well as certain "responsible agencies" to take discrete planning and regulatory actions to approve the Specific Plan. Described below are the discretionary actions necessary to fully implement the Specific Plan. In addition to certifying the Final EIR, adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and adopting these Findings and the associated Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA requirements), the project applicant requested the following entitlements and approvals from the City:

- approval of general plan amendments,
- adoption of the ARSP and Amoruso Ranch Design Guidelines,
- pre-zoning of property to be consistent with the ARSP land uses,
- approval of development agreements between the City, landowner, and the project applicant,
- approval of Community Facilities District and/or other financing mechanisms,
- amendment of the Urban Water Master Plan,
- approval of the Water Supply Assessment,

- amendment of the Capital Improvement Program,

- amendment of the Bicycle Master Plan,

- allocation of 1066 acre-feet per year of City surface water to the ARSP area, and

- condemnation or acquisition of property and right of way for City and public improvements.

Other Project approvals and associated entitlements that must be granted by responsible agencies and federal agencies include or may include the following:

- approval of a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, for discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States,

- expansion of the 2005 Service Area Boundary by the South Placer Wastewater Authority to include the ARSP area,

- approval of a Section 401 Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB"),

- approval of a Municipal Services Report by the Placer County Local Area Formation Commission ("LAFCO"),

- approval by LAFCO of a Sphere of Influence Amendment,

- approval by LAFCO of annexation of the ARSP area to the City and reorganization of the City's corporate boundaries, consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act,

- approval of a General Construction permit, including the development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, by the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB"),

- approval of a Master Reclamation permit by SWRCB to address recycled water delivery from the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant ("PGWWTP"),

- approval by RWQCB for the modification of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit for the PGWWTP,

- approval of a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game, and

- a permit to operate from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District ("PCAPCD")

2.3.1. Land Use Plan

As shown in Figure 2-4 of the DEIR, the proposed ARSP land use plan consists of LDR, MDR, and HDR uses; community commercial uses; public/quasi-public uses; parks and recreation areas; open space; paseos; urban reserve area; and roadways.

Residential Neighborhoods

The Proposed Project provides for construction of approximately 2,827 dwelling units in three density ranges, LDR, MDR, and HDR on 337.2 acres consistent with the residential density ranges in the Roseville General Plan. The proposed densities are as follows:

- **Low Density Residential** – Approximately 248.8 acres of the ARSP are proposed as LDR with a permitted density range of 0.5 to 6.9 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Table 2-1 assumes a density of 5 du/ac for a total of 1,302 dwelling units.

- **Medium Density Residential** – Approximately 50.3 acres of the ARSP are proposed as MDR with a permitted density range of 7.0 to 12.9 du/ac. Table 2-1 assumes a density of 11 du/ac for a total of 542 dwelling units.

- **High Density Residential** – Approximately 38.1 acres of the ARSP are proposed as HDR with a permitted density range of 13.0 to 30 du/ac. Table 2-1 assumes a density of 22.9 dwelling units per acre for a total of 873 dwelling units.

Table 2-1: Land Use Summary

General Plan Land Use Designation / Description	Applied Zoning Districts[1]	Acres	Units
Residential Neighborhoods			
LDR Low Density Residential	R1 and RS	248.8	1,302
MDR Medium Density Residential	RS	50.3	542
HDR High Density Residential	R3	38.1	873
Subtotal		337.2	2,717
Commercial			
CC Community Commercial - Village	CMU-SA	27.3	109
CC Community Commercial	CC	23.9	
Subtotal		51.2	109
Parks and Open Space			
OS General Open Space	OS	134.8	
OS Paseos	OS	10.7	
P/R Parks & Recreation	PR	22.1	
Subtotal		167.7	
Public/Quasi Public			
P/QP Elementary School	P/QP	9.6	
P/QP Fire Station	P/QP	3.0	
P/QP Recycling Center and Well Site	P/QP	3.5	
P/QP Lift Station A	P/QP	0.3	
P/QP Lift Station B	P/QP	0.9	
Subtotal		17.2	
Other			
UR Urban Reserve	UR	20.0	1
ROW Roadway Right of Way		52.0	
NAPOTS		49.2	
Subtotal		121.2	1
Overall Totals		694.4	2,827

[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 www.roseville.ca.us.

Commercial

The Proposed Project includes 51.2 acres of land designated for commercial use, under the commercial land use classifications of Community Commercial – Village District and Community Commercial.

- **Community Commercial – Village District** – The ARSP includes one centrally located 27.3-acre site with a proposed general plan designation of Community Commercial – Village District (CC-VC) and zoning district of Commercial Mixed Use – Special Area overlay (CMU-SA). The area is proposed as the "Village District", and is intended to

provide a mix and density of land uses common to an urban setting or traditional downtown. The CC-VC land use designation is intended to develop mixed-use centers that allow for a combination of commercial, office, and residential uses. These sites are intended to promote a variety of commercial use types and the flexible siting of other uses that are typically considered to be compatible with commercial development. The Proposed Project has a residential allocation of 109 residential uses (i.e. lofts, condominiums, etc.).

- **Community Commercial** – The ARSP includes one large commercial site on the north end of the project site totaling approximately 23.9 acres. This land use category is intended to provide a broad range of goods, services, and employment opportunities to an expanded service area. Commercial buildings would likely range from 50,000 to 250,000 square feet. The Community Commercial parcel is located adjacent to a possible future interchange along Placer Parkway that would support regional commercial and business park uses.

Parks and Open Space

A combination of active and passive parkland would be provided within two categories described below.

- **Neighborhood Parks** – Seven sites totaling 22.1 acres are designated for neighborhood parks ranging in size from 1.28 to 10.1 acres. Neighborhood are planned in locations adjacent to open space, where possible, and to serve residential neighborhoods. Park sites would include passive and active recreation facilities and would be linked to a system of paseos, providing a comprehensive network of pedestrian and bikeway connections to the ASRP's parks and open space system. Proposed parks include a 3.04-acre park in the Village District (AR-66), five distinct neighborhood parks (AR-60, -61, -63, -64, and -67), and a 10-acre park in the northern portion of the site (AR-62).

- **Open Space** – Approximately 134.8 acres of the ARSP are proposed as open space. The largest area located along the southern boundary of the project site that captures the University Creek corridor, a tributary to Pleasant Grove Creek, located to the south would be maintained as an open space preserve in perpetuity. Within the open space area, approximately 98 acres would be designated as a permanent on-site open space preserve (AR92, AR97, and AR95). The open space areas are intended to serve a variety of functions including providing floodwater conveyance, stormwater treatment, aesthetic amenities, recreational facilities (trails) and habitat preservation (seasonal wetlands, vernal pool complexes). Open space areas are proposed to abut other regional open space areas, including portions of the CSP's open space preserve to the south, portions of the West Roseville Specific Plan's open space preserve to the southeast, and the City's Al Johnson Wildlife Area to the west.

Public/Quasi Public

The ARSP would include 17.2 acres of Public/Quasi Public (P/QP). The P/QP land use designation accommodates a variety of public-serving uses and facilities. These sites would provide for an elementary school, fire station, and areas for specific infrastructure related items such as a groundwater well and any other facility required of the ARSP. These areas are discussed in more detail below.

Urban Reserve

The 20-acre Wagner parcel located in the south-central portion of the Proposed Project site would be designated Urban Reserve. The Urban Reserve land use designation is applied to lands that may receive urban land use approvals at some time in the future, but are currently constrained by growth management policies or other limitations. Allowable uses include agriculture, open space, passive recreation, resource protection, and a caretaker's residence.

Masonry Walls

Masonry walls will be constructed within the project site to provide security, screening, privacy, and/or sound attenuation where appropriate. At a minimum, masonry walls will be located along the project boundary on West Sunset Boulevard, along the property boundary of residential uses adjacent to Placer Parkway, and the eastern edge of the property boundary adjacent to the Placer Ranch area within the County.

2.3.2. Circulation

Roadways

As shown in Exhibit 2-7 of the DEIR, the Proposed Project includes the development of transportation infrastructure improvements. Access and circulation within the ARSP would be provided through construction of the following primary roadways:

- Westbrook Boulevard is the proposed main arterial roadway serving the site from the south extending northward from its future terminus within the CSP. As part of the Proposed Project, four of the planned six lanes would be constructed, including three signalized intersections, a landscaped median separating northbound and southbound travel lanes and a striped bike lane on both sides of Westbrook Boulevard.

- Road B and Road D are proposed minor four-lane arterial roadways which will consist of two travel lanes in each direction, on-street Class 2 bike lanes, and a landscaped median that allows for protected left turn lanes.

- Road A is a proposed modified collector that provides for one travel lane and on-street striped bike lanes in each direction, separated by a striped center turn lane along with a landscaped parkway and sidewalk or pedestrian path on each side.

- The ARSP provides several types of local roadways depending on the location and the desired interface between land uses and the roadway system. The typical standard for a local street would include two travel lanes with space for on-street parallel parking and a detached sidewalk.

- A total of six new signals are anticipated within the project site located at the following intersections: Westbrook Boulevard/Road A, Westbrook Boulevard/Road B, Westbrook Boulevard Road D, Westbrook Boulevard/West Sunset Boulevard, Road B/Road A, and Road D/Road A.

Pedestrian and Bikeway Facilities

As shown in Figure 2-12 of the DEIR, a system of pedestrian and bikeway paths is proposed throughout the ARSP. The pedestrian and bikeway network includes a combination of Class 1 bike trails, Class 1A sidewalks, Class 2 bike lanes, and Class 3 bike routes.

All streets within Amoruso Ranch will have sidewalks on both sides, or a sidewalk on one side and a multipurpose trail on the other. Sidewalks within residential neighborhoods will be predominantly five feet wide and separated from the street by a landscaped parkway strip.

As shown in Figure 2-5 of the DEIR, approximately two miles of open space paseos are proposed to connect various destinations, including the Village District, school, and park sites. Paseos will be ten-foot wide paved pathways within the landscaped corridors.

Transit

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) facilities would be included along Westbrook Boulevard within the ARSP to accommodate a proposed route that may extend from Sacramento Regional Transit's Light Rail Station at Watt Avenue/I-80 north along Watt Avenue through the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) and CSP to the ARSP. Bus turnouts and shelters, which can be utilized as BRT transit stops, shall be constructed in accordance with City Improvement Standards. A total of 25 parking spaces within the commercial uses of Parcel AR-53 will be designated for park and ride users. Proposed transit facility locations are identified on Figure 2-13 of the DEIR.

2.3.3. Public Facilities and Services

The ARSP would include public facilities and services required to serve the project site in accordance with the City's General Plan. The on-site utility infrastructure would be constructed and installed in phases to coincide with development approvals, and would be designed to accommodate buildout of the ARSP. Easements and dedications of improvements would be provided consistent with the ARSP, the project Development Agreements, and other applicable standards and requirements of the City.

Water Service and Potable Water

Once annexed, the City would be responsible for the acquisition, development, treatment, transmission, and delivery of potable and irrigation water supplies to the ARSP. As part of the project, a new source and supply of surface water would be acquired from the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), through its Ophir Water Treatment facility. Onsite components would consist of distribution pipe networks and a groundwater well to meet demands in drier conditions. All water improvements will be constructed to City standards using a phased approach. Two existing wells will be decommissioned as part of the Proposed Project.

The ARSP would include construction of one on-site groundwater well designed with aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) capabilities to augment city water supplies during emergency situations and for back up water supplies. The ARSP would connect to the City's existing water infrastructure through a single point connection extending from the CSP Area along the extension of Westbrook Boulevard and making allowances for future connections to provide looping within the system. The Proposed Project includes utility infrastructure required to maintain an acceptable level of service to the project site.

Wastewater

The City provides regional wastewater treatment services to areas within the City's wastewater service area boundaries. Wastewater flows from the ARSP will be directed to the PGWWTP through the southern portion of the site, where it will connect with a transmission line to be provided by the CSP. Infrastructure within the CSP Area was planned and sized to accommodate flow from the ARSP. A small sewer lift station facility is required to pump wastewater under the proposed Placer Parkway alignment from the northwest corner of the project site. The lift station would be a "typical" neighborhood lift station designed with submersible pumps in a manhole-type wet well. The remainder of the Proposed Project would be designed to flow by gravity to a proposed central lift station located along the southern boundary of the project site (P/QP parcel AR-57). The existing sewage disposal system will be located, pumped, and properly abandoned as part of the demolition of the existing ranch-house.

Recycled Water

Recycled water use within the project site would be limited to irrigation demands of HDR and all non-residential land uses within the exception of the small area north of Placer Parkway. The City would provide the ARSP with recycled water from the PGWWTP. As shown in Figure 2-16 of the DEIR, a looped backbone system of dedicated non-potable water lines ranging in size from 6 inches to 12 inches would be constructed running parallel to the collector and arterial roadway system, south of the future Placer Parkway. Recycled water pipelines heading to the east from Westbrook Boulevard are located within Roads B and D. The City's existing tank and pumping facilities are slated for expansion to meet the needs of the region, including ARSP, CSP, and SVSP Areas.

Solid Waste

The City would provide solid waste services to the ARSP. A solid waste recycling area is planned within the ARSP on parcel AR-55, which is a larger utility site that also includes a municipal well. The recycling area and well will be encompassed by a masonry wall. This site will provide residents with a location to drop off-load recyclable materials. Vehicular access to the site is at the intersection of Road A and Road B, east of Westbrook Boulevard.

Electrical Service

The project site currently is within the service area of Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). If it is annexed to the City, Roseville Electric would provide electric service to the project site. Proposed electrical backbone facilities are shown in Figure 2-17 of the DEIR. Roseville Electric has no existing distribution facilities immediately adjacent to the site. The ARSP would be served from the Creekview electrical substation planned to be constructed within the CSP Area. Underground electrical distribution will be extended to the project site through a 12 kV system to individual parcels in conjunction with roadway improvements or as phasing requirements dictate. Street lighting, signal power and other ancillary power facilities will be provided along all public street frontages as part of the overall roadway frontage improvements.

Natural Gas

PG&E would provide natural gas upon request and in accordance with the rules and tariffs of the California Public Utilities Commission. PG&E's long-range plans provide for availability of gas service to accommodate increased demand. Service would be provided to the project site from existing and planned infrastructure adjacent to the project site. Delivery of gas service to individual projects in the ARSP will be reviewed by PG&E at the time of proposal.

Communications

The project site is within the service areas of AT&T, Comcast, and Wave Broadband. Together, these providers offer both voice and data communication services. Distribution lines to individual parcels would be extended from existing infrastructure adjacent to the project site in accordance with the phasing approach for dry utilities. The appropriate providers would deliver telephone, cable television, and high-speed data line services to individual projects in the ARSP.

Street Lighting

Street lighting would be provided along all public roadways in the ARSP as part of the roadway frontage improvements at intervals in accordance with City standards. All electric and street light facilities would be constructed to the City's standards.

Police and Fire Protection

The Roseville Police Department would serve the project site. The Roseville Police Department provides all operations and patrols out of its central station on Junction Boulevard, approximately seven miles from the southern boundary of the project site.

The Roseville Fire Department would provide fire protection, fire suppression, emergency medical, and hazardous materials management services to the ARSP. As shown on Figure 2-18 of the DEIR, a three-acre fire station site is proposed in the southeast portion of the project site. This station will provide first response within the project site. Timing of construction and staffing of the fire station will be consistent with the Fire Department Standards of Response Coverage Study. Stations located outside the project site will provide interim and secondary response.

Schools

The Proposed Project includes one 9.6-acre school site (AR-50) to accommodate the future demand for new elementary school that would be generated by residential development in this area. The location of the elementary school site can be seen on Figure 2-18 of the DEIR. It is anticipated the school will be a two-story, 800- student urban school that supports the community character of an urban village. Facility planning and the sequencing of development of the school would be determined by the Roseville City School District. Middle school and high school students will attend existing schools outside of the project site.

Libraries

The public library at Mahany Park, operated by the City provides services to the western portion of the City including the ARSP. No additional library facilities are planned as a part of the ARSP.

2.3.4. Stormwater

The project site is wholly contained within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed. University Creek, a tributary to Pleasant Grove Creek, meanders westerly near the southern border of the ARSP, crossing both the southeast and southwest corners of the ARSP before and after passing through the proposed CSP Area. An area around and including this tributary is covered by Zone A on the currently effective Flood Insurance Rate Map panel 0601C0400F dated June 8, 1998.

As a result of past farming practices that created leveled fields and drainage diversions, the existing site drainage is constricted in two locations along the western boundary. One is within the University Creek shed and the other is a minor tributary to the University Creek shed located in the central portion of the project site. These constrictions are manmade and create bottlenecks in the conveyance of floodwaters. As a result, water surface elevations are higher on portions of the project site, as compared to the more natural and historic drainage patterns.

Proposed Drainage System

As described in the *Drainage Master Plan* included as Appendix I of the DEIR, stormwater flows from the project site will be directed to Low Impact Development (LID) features to improve the water quality before entering the proposed storm drain network. This storm drain system will have a network of underground storm drainage pipes ranging in size from 18 inches to 72 inches in diameter and surface collector channels. The three open channel drainage facilities will drain the majority of the project site on the western and southwestern borders. As shown on Figure 2-19 of the DEIR, the proposed stormwater drainage system collects runoff from the developed areas into subsurface drain pipes of varying sizes, which then outfall to either the open space areas near University Creek or to the proposed open channel drainage facilities.

Stormwater Quality

The ARSP provides a comprehensive plan for the management of urban runoff for flow control and water quality improvement. The proposed stormwater management system would fulfill the requirements of the City's NPDES Phase II Permit applicable at the time of development, as issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and would minimize the negative effects of urban stormwater runoff on the natural open space areas, including wetland areas and principal drainage corridors. LID measures would be incorporated throughout both pre and post phases of the site development.

Stormwater management during construction activities will be addressed through a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) document specific to and prepared for the ARSP. The use of BMPs during the construction process will generally incorporate erosion controls and sediment controls. Erosion and sediment control BMPs include such things as applying straw mulch to disturbed areas, the use of fiber rolls and silt fences, sedimentation basins, drain inlet protection, stabilized construction accesses, and material management.

The ARSP will address the requirements set forth by the Stormwater Manual and NPDES regulations for post construction BMP requirements by implementing measures associated with source control, runoff reduction, and treatment control for the post construction conditions.

2.3.5. Off-Site Improvements

The majority of infrastructure improvements necessary to serve the ARSP will extend north from the CSP, and thus were previously analyzed within the certified Final EIR for that project. The following additional off-site improvements (shown on Figure 2-20 and 2-21 of the DEIR) are proposed as part of the ARSP and are covered by this EIR.

- Drainage improvements planned within the approximately 17-acre off-site Al Johnson Improvements Area include the excavation of existing University Creek along the western boundary of the ARSP, and the installation of conveyance infrastructure (piping and/or ditching) along the future alignment of Placer Parkway within the project site and the Reason Farms Property.

- Construction of new infrastructure to deliver additional water required by ARSP includes a new self-contained pump adjacent to the Tinker Pump Station, new pipeline connection or new feeder stations, and new pipeline along Tinker Road.
- Improvements to West Sunset Boulevard include widening the existing 22-foot wide roadway section to the south, construction of a drainage ditch for the length of the project site and providing turn lanes at the intersections of Westbrook Boulevard and Amoruso Way. Along the frontage of the project site, a landscaped corridor will be provided behind the drainage ditch and will have a five-foot wide pedestrian path. Additionally, a maximum seven-foot masonry wall will be constructed between the property boundaries and the landscape corridor.

2.4. Project Objectives

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to implement a large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density master planned community in the City consistent with the City's Guiding Principles related to new development west of Roseville and the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies. The ultimate development pattern and urban framework for the ARSP are guided by the following project objectives:

- **Complete Comprehensive Planning for the Project Site** - Formulate a specific plan and related land use planning documents that respond to the City's need to provide housing and services in an orderly growth pattern, accommodate the City's regional share of population growth, are compatible with adjacent land uses, and provide new benefits to the City.
- **Mix of Land Uses** - Design a comprehensively planned, residential-based community with a mix of land uses within the ARSP to create a balanced community with approximately 3,000 residential units, commercial and business professional uses, parks and open space, and supporting public/quasi-public uses.
- **Existing Policies** - Satisfy the City policies, regulations, and expectations as defined in the City's General Plan, City/Placer County MOU/USFWS MOU, Growth Management Visioning Committee recommendations, Zoning Ordinance, Community Design Standards, Improvement Standards, and any other applicable plans, documents, and programs adopted by the City.
- **Blueprint Consistency** - Provide for development which meets the City's nine identified Blueprint Implementation Strategies adopted by the Council in June of 2005. Achieve project design characteristics reflective of the general policy direction embodied in the City's adopted General Plan and Blueprint Implementation Strategies, including connectivity among neighborhoods, commercial uses, schools and parks, and preservation of open space.
- **Employment Opportunities** - Provide for multiple retail and office opportunities that would provide employment opportunities within the project site.
- **Housing Opportunities** - Plan for approximately 3,000 units to provide housing choices in varying densities to respond to a range of market segments, including a mix of single-

family homes, and multi-family homes and affordable housing opportunities consistent with the City's General Plan.

- **Regional Housing Needs Allocation** - Aid the City in meeting its obligation to accommodate a percentage of future population growth in the region (as embodied in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation [RHNA] identified by SACOG and the California Department of Housing and Community Development [HCD]).
- **Community Form** - Shape the physical form and character of development that is functional and creates a sense of place in order to:
    - Clearly define the northwestern edge for the City;
    - Create a land use transition and connection from existing City northerly, and westerly to the Al Johnson Wildlife Area and unincorporated Placer County;
    - Organize neighborhoods to be appropriately sized and walkable;
    - Provide a network of trails and parks that link together gathering places such as commercial areas, parks, and schools; and
    - Provide adequate school services to students generated in the project site.
- **Mixed-Use Nodes** - Provide neighborhoods that are within a short walking distance to the commercial areas, which provide for a variety of services such as restaurants, shops, neighborhood serving uses, and offices.
- **Regional and Area Roadways** - Facilitate the extension of Westbrook Boulevard to West Sunset Boulevard and connections to future development to the east, and provide land for the future Placer Parkway alignment. Provide a safe and efficient circulation system which interconnects uses and promotes pedestrian circulation and alternative transportation options. Create a circulation network which complements north/south and east/west circulation routes.
- **Park Facilities** - Provide a network of parks and trails that link together all aspects of the community.
- **Pedestrian & Bicycle Connections** – Provide an extensive network of trails and sidewalks that link neighborhoods, parks, paseos, and local and regional open space areas.
- **Public Transportation Options** - Through implementation of City arterial and collector street improvement standards, provide the opportunity to install fixed-route bus stops and transit facilities in support of the City's overall transit planning efforts.
- **Resource Management** - Ensure open space preserve areas are managed consistent with the City's policies and Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan.
- **Contribute to Regional Preserve Planning** - Create open space preserves that provide regional benefit for habitat, resources, and open space amenities consistent with the proposed Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP).
- **Habitat Conservation & Creation** - Balance development with resource protection, including preservation of the creek corridor, sensitive habitat with wetland resources in an

inter-connected, permanent open space. Create multi-functional habitat with water quality benefits within the open space corridors.

- **Fiscal Contribution -** Include a mix of land uses and facilities which are fiscally feasible and implement funding mechanisms to maintain a neutral / positive fiscal impact to the City's General Fund.
- **Long Term Growth -** Plan for long term growth to be positioned to react to market demand. The ARSP is intended to guide development over a 20-year to 30-year horizon.
- **Program-Level Parcel Objectives -** The Wagner parcel is intended to remain in an Urban Reserve land use and has one residential unit allocated to it. No additional or specific project objectives for this parcel have been identified as there are no specific development plans for this parcel at this time.

3. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

CEQA requires public agencies to consider the potential effects of their discretionary activities on the environment and, when feasible, to adopt and implement mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen the effects of those activities on the environment. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
2) Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(Public Resources Code section 21081, subd (a); see also CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subd. (a).)

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (*Goleta II*) (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.) The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).) "[F]easibility" under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Ibid*.; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoyah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing "'economic, environmental, social, and technological factors' … 'an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground'"].)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, section 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

Because the EIR identified significant effects that may occur as a result of the project, and in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines presented above, the City hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the Proposed Project. These findings reflect the independent judgment of the City and constitute its best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the City's approval of the Proposed Project.

3.1. Evidentiary Basis for Findings

These Findings are based upon substantial evidence in the record before the City. The references to the DEIR and Final EIR set forth in the Findings are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these Findings.

3.2. Procedural Findings

The City Council of the City of Roseville finds as follows:

> Based on the nature and scope of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, the City of Roseville determined, based on substantial evidence, that the project may have a significant impact on the environment and prepared an EIR for the Proposed Project. The EIR was prepared, noticed, published, circulated, reviewed and completed in full compliance with CEQA (PRC Sections 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Sections 15000 et seq.), as follows:
>
> - A NOP of the DEIR was filed with the Office of Planning and Research and was circulated for public comments from October 30, 2013 through December 2, 2013.
>
> - A notice of availability (NOA) of the DEIR was mailed to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals who had previously requested notice in writing as of February 22, 2016. The NOA stated that the City had completed the DEIR and that copies were available for public review at the City of Roseville Planning Division located at 311 Vernon Street, and online at www.roseville.ca.us/amoruso.
>
> - A public notice was placed in the Roseville Press-Tribune on February 26, 2016, which stated that the DEIR was available for public review and comment.
>
> - A public notice was posted in the office of the City of Roseville Planning Division on February 22, 2016.
>
> - Following closure of the public comment period, all comments received on the DEIR during the comment period, the City's written responses to the significant environmental points raised in those comments, and additional information added by the City were added to the DEIR to produce the Final EIR.

3.3. Certification of the EIR

In accordance with CEQA, the City has considered the effects of the project on the environment, as shown in the Final EIR, and the whole of the administrative record, prior to taking any action to approve the Proposed Project. The Final EIR was released for public review on March 1, 2016. The City reviewed the Final EIR and, at the June 15, 2016 public hearing, recommended that the EIR be certified. The City has reviewed and considered the EIR and the information relating to the

environmental impacts of the proposed project and has certified that the EIR has been prepared and completed in compliance with CEQA. By these Findings, the City ratifies and adopts the conclusions of the Final EIR as set forth in these Findings, except where such conclusions are specifically modified by these Findings. The Final EIR and these Findings represent the independent judgment and analysis of the City.

3.4. Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures Adopted

Except as otherwise noted, the mitigation measures referenced herein are those identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the City as set forth in the MMRP.

Impacts After Implementation of Mitigation Measures

Except as otherwise stated in these Findings, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15092, the City finds that environmental effects of the Proposed Project will not be significant or will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by the adopted mitigation measures. All significant environmental effects have been eliminated or substantially lessened to the extent feasible. The City has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment that are found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to overriding considerations described in Section 4. These overriding considerations consist of specific social, environmental, and economic benefits of the project that justify its approval and outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, as more fully stated in Section 4. Except as otherwise stated in these Findings, the City finds that the mitigation measures incorporated into and imposed upon the Proposed Project will not have new significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in the EIR.

Relationship of Findings and MMRP to Final EIR

These Findings and the MMRP are intended to summarize and describe the contents and conclusions of the Draft and Final EIR for policymakers and the public. In the event that there is any inconsistency between the descriptions of mitigation measures in these Findings or the MMRP and the Final EIR, the City and/or the Applicant will implement the measures as they are described in these Findings and the attached MMRP. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these Findings or from the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Findings and/or MMRP, as applicable.

3.5. Location and Custodian of Records

Pursuant to PRC section 15091, the City is the custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the decision is based, and such documents and other materials are located at the City of Roseville Planning Division at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678. Additionally, many of the documents and materials are available online at:

http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/_planning/specific_plans_n_planning_areas/amoruso_ranch_specific_plan.asp.

3.6. Findings Related to Project Alternatives

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and analyze the relative environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed project and evaluate their comparative impacts and merits (see State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 [a-c]). The EIR must consider a range of reasonable alternatives that can feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant impacts. Alternatives that would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly may also be considered. The environmentally superior alternative must be identified among the alternatives considered.

The alternatives analysis must identify the potential alternatives, and include sufficient information about each to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. The discussion must focus on potentially feasible alternatives that can avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project.

Qualitative and quantitative measures of alternative feasibility may include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, consistency or conflict with other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an alternative site. Similarly, if an alternative would cause one or more significant impacts, in addition to those that would be caused by the project, the significant impacts of the alternative must be discussed, but in less detail than the project analysis.

As required by CEQA, the alternatives analysis must include evaluation of the "no project" alternative. "No project" is defined as what would occur within the project site if the project were not to be approved. The "no project" alternative "would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." CEQA also requires that an EIR identify an "environmentally superior alternative" from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated.

The City finds that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the project and could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the projected objectives or might be more costly. The City also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed, and discussed in the review process of the EIR and the ultimate decision on the project.

3.6.1. Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 and in light of the project objectives, the following alternatives to the project were identified and evaluated in the DEIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Density, Similar Development Footprint Alternative

- Alternative 3: Compact Development Footprint Alternative
- Alternative 4: Minimum Wetland Impact Alternative

The City Council rejects the alternatives set forth and evaluated in the EIR because the City finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make these alternatives infeasible. In making these determinations, the City Council is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors."

In addition to a comparison of impacts to the environment, an economic feasibility analysis was prepared that determines the impact of each of the alternatives and the associated development costs on the feasibility of developing the ARSP. (DPFG, Environmental Impact Report Alternatives, Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Economic Feasibility Analysis, 2016.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Under CEQA, the No Project Alternative must consider the effects of foregoing the Proposed Project. The purpose of analyzing the No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of the Proposed Project to the action of no project. The No Project Alternative describes the environmental conditions that exist at the time that the NOP circulated, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (CEQA Guidelines 15126[e][2]).

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would remain in its current agricultural/rural use and minimum 80-acre farming zoning. It is reasonably foreseeable that under the No Project Alternative, Placer Parkway would be extended through the northern portion of the project site under future conditions, similar to the Proposed Project. Without annexation, general plan amendments, a specific plan, prezoning, and other approvals such as those sought as part of the Proposed Project, it is not reasonably foreseeable that the area would develop with urban land uses. While as many as eight farms at 80 acres each could theoretically occupy the project site, such subdivision of agricultural land is not common in south Placer County. Therefore, it is assumed that no development would occur and existing uses (seasonal cattle grazing) would continue.

Impacts related to the Proposed Project identified in Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the DEIR would not occur under the No Project Alternative, because the project site would remain in its current agricultural use. None of the identified mitigation measures would be required, and none of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR would occur under this alternative.

Based on impact analyses, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project. However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives because it does not include a development project. Most notably, the No Project

Alternative is inconsistent with the objective that seeks to meet the City's share of regional housing needs and with the regional planning goals of the SACOG Blueprint. Because of its inconsistency with SACOG Blueprint principles, the No Project Alternative, while environmentally superior to the Proposed Project in the short term, could, over time, become environmentally inferior.

For all of the reasons set forth above, and each of them individually, the City Council hereby rejects the No Project Alternative because it is infeasible.

Alternative 2: Reduced Density, Similar Development Footprint

Under the Reduced Density, Similar Development Footprint Alternative (Alternative 2), open space would remain the same as the Proposed Project, but residential densities would be reduced by approximately 18 percent. As a result, the number of units and population associated with this alternative would be less than under the Proposed Project. The acreage of all other uses, including commercial, parks, public/quasi-public (including the school), and right-of-way would be identical to the Proposed Project.

Environmental Impacts Compared to Proposed Project. Unavoidable impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar to the Proposed Project. Many impacts would remain the same as the Proposed Project with the exception of traffic, air quality, GHG emissions, operational noise, potential buried archaeological and paleontological resources, public services, public utilities, and storm water runoff rates and volumes, which would be incrementally reduced.

Although Alternative 2 would generally meet most project objectives, the City rejects this alternative as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA for the following reasons:

Consistency with Adopted City Policies. Alternative 2 is not consistent with the SACOG Blueprint principles. Because fewer residential units would be accommodated within the project site, Alternative 2 would divert residential development to other locations in the region or farther away from the existing urban footprint, which could create additional environmental impacts, including increased long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, increased per capita wastewater generation, and increased per capita air pollutant and GHG emissions.

Economic Feasibility. An economic feasibility analysis was prepared by Development Planning & Financing Group, Inc. (DPFG) (dated May 17, 2016), which estimated the infrastructure cost burden based on the total infrastructure cost per developable acre and the ratio of total cost burden per home. The infrastructure cost burden, expressed as a percentage of the estimated average home price, is a generally accepted indicator of whether a reasonable and prudent developer would proceed with development. Based on a review of public agency financial planning documents, a cost burden of 15 percent is optimal, but cost burdens between 10 and 20 percent are considered acceptable. As described in the *ARSP Economic Feasibility Analysis*, Alternative 2 is economically infeasible (DPFG 2016). Alternative 2 increases the cost per developable acre to $269,843, which causes the land value to decrease by $2,416 per acre from the Proposed Project. Nevertheless, it is

above the feasible range with a 22.7 percent average cost burden per home. Alternative 2 would impose the highest total cost burden per unit of all of the alternatives considered in the EIR, at $88,824 (compared to $79,624 for the Proposed Project). Alternative 2 would also not generate a high enough internal rate of return (IRR) to attract private equity investors, which would be necessary due to limitations associated with other types of financing such as bank loans, bonds, or government loans. Without the ability to obtain funding for the construction of the required infrastructure, Alternative 2 is considered economically infeasible.

For all of the reasons set forth above, and each of them individually, the City Council hereby rejects further consideration of Alternative 2 as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE 3: HIGH DENSITY, COMPACT DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT

Under the High Density/Compact Development Alternative (Alternative 3), open space would be increased as shown in Figure 6-2 of the EIR. Alternative 3 was developed by increasing open space in the areas of the site that contain the greatest concentrations of vernal pools or drainage areas. Developed areas would be reduced to 420.5 acres (compared to 479.7 acres in the Proposed Project), and open space would increase to 205 acres (compared to 145.5 acres in the Proposed Project). The number of residential units would be approximately the same (109 unit increase); however, the residential footprint would be decreased by 18 percent (60 acres) through an increase in high density units offset by a corresponding decrease in the number of medium and low density units. The acreage of all other uses, including commercial, parks, public/quasi-public (including the school), and right-of-way would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Environmental Impacts Compared to Proposed Project. Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project due to the reduced development footprint. Because a similar level of development is proposed, most impacts would be the same as the Proposed Project, with the exception of impacts to biological resources, potential buried archaeological and paleontological resources, storm water runoff rates and volumes, and visual character, which would be incrementally reduced. Alternative 3 would meet most of the project objectives.

Although Alternative 3 would meet most of the project objectives and is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, the City Council rejects this alternative as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA for the following reasons:

Population, Employment and Housing. By decreasing the number of medium and low density units, Alternative 3 would provide fewer housing opportunities in varying densities to respond to a range of market segments compared to the Proposed Project.

Economic Feasibility. As described in the *ARSP Economic Feasibility Analysis*, Alternative 3 is economically infeasible (DPFG 2016). Compared to the Proposed Project, the cost per developable acre of Alternative 3 is 6.7 percent higher at $285,227, which is illustrated as a decrease in land value of $17,800 per acre, even though the cost burden per home is 21.2 percent, which is comparable to the Proposed Project. However, taking into consideration the time value of money,

residual land value and cash flow as reflected by the IRR, Alternative 3, at 5.6 percent, does not come close to meeting the 20 percent IRR minimum threshold needed to attract private equity investors. Without the ability to obtain funding for the construction of the required infrastructure, Alternative 3 is economically infeasible.

For all of the reasons set forth above, and each of them individually, the City hereby rejects further consideration of Alternative 3 as infeasible.

ALTERNATIVE 4: MINIMUM WETLAND IMPACT

Under the Minimum Wetland Impact Footprint Alternative, open space would be substantially increased. Alternative 4 was conceptualized by minimizing development in areas of the site that contain delineated jurisdictional wetlands. Developed areas would be reduced to 346.9 acres (compared to 479.7 acres in the Proposed Project), and open space would increase to 278.6 acres (compared to 145.5 acres in the Proposed Project). As a result, the number of units and population associated with this alternative would be less than under the Proposed Project, as would acreage dedicated to parks, public/quasi-public uses and roadways.

Environmental Impacts Compared to Proposed Project. Alternative 4 would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because substantially fewer acres would be developed and less development is proposed. In most cases, the impacts of Alternative 4 would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project. Impacts to vernal pool habitats would be avoided. Alternative 4 would meet most of the project objectives.

Although Alternative 4 would generally meet most project objectives, the City rejects this alternative as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA for the following reasons:

Consistency with Adopted City Policies. The reduced internal connectivity and cohesion under Alternative 4 is inconsistent with SACGO Blueprint Principles for development design. Because of its inconsistency with SACOG Blueprint Principles, Alternative 4, while environmentally superior to the Proposed Project in the short term, may be environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project in the long-term compared to future baseline conditions assuming all 2050 regional growth anticipated by SACOG. Under the future scenario, the Proposed Project would be superior to Alternative 4 with respect to long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, long-term per capita wastewater generation, and long-term per capita air pollutant and GHG emissions.

Population, Employment and Housing. Under Alternative 4 only 1,979 residential units would be developed compared to 2,827 residential units under the Proposed Project. Because approximately 25 percent fewer HDR units would be developed under Alternative 4, it provides the City with fewer options to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 10 percent affordable units and its need to accommodate lower income households.

Economic Feasibility. As described in the *ARSP Economic Feasibility Analysis*, Alternative 4 is economically infeasible (DPFG 2016). Compared to the Proposed Project, the cost per developable acre of Alternative 4 is slightly higher at $269,233, thus reducing the land value by $1,806, even though the cost burden per home is 21.3 percent, which is slightly lower than the Proposed Project. However, taking into consideration the time value of money, residual land value and cash flow as reflected by the IRR, Alternative 4, at 10.4 percent, does not meet the 20 percent IRR minimum threshold needed to attract private equity investors. Without the ability to obtain funding for the construction of the required infrastructure, Alternative 4 is economically infeasible.

For all of the reasons set forth above, and each of them individually, the City Council hereby rejects further consideration of Alternative 4 as infeasible.

3.6.2. Environmentally Superior Alternative

According to Section 15126.6 (d) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is required to identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. The environmentally superior alternative would be the alternative that results in the fewest significant environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project. If the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

The No Project Alternative would reduce the greatest number of project impacts, and would, therefore, be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project. Among the other alternatives, Alternative 4, Minimum Wetland Impact Alternative, would be considered the environmentally superior alternative because it reduces more of the project's significant project impacts compared to the other project alternatives, and creates no additional significant impacts. Alternative 4 would result in reduced impacts with respect to:

1) traffic and transportation;
2) construction and operational air quality emissions;
3) climate change and GHG emissions;
4) construction and operational noise;
5) wetlands and grasslands;
6) potential buried archaeological and paleontological resources;
7) public services (police, fire, schools, and libraries);
8) public utilities (water, recycled water, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas);
9) storm water runoff rates and volumes; and
10) alterations to the visual character.

Alternative 4 also would preserve the most open space.

For all of the reasons explained above in section 3.6.1 and each of them individually, however, the City Council concludes that Alternative 4 is infeasible and declines to adopt it.

3.7. Effects Found Not to be Significant

Effects of the Proposed Project found to be less than significant, and which require no mitigation, are identified in Table 3-1 of the DEIR. The City has reviewed the record and agrees with the conclusion that such impacts would be less than significant, and therefore no additional findings are needed.

3.8. Significant Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

The Proposed Project has potentially significant environmental impacts in the areas discussed below. The DEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce some or all of the environmental impacts in these areas, although some impacts remain significant even with implementation of all feasible mitigation.

3.8.1. Land Use and Agricultural Resources

Impact 4.1-2 (Potential Incompatibility of Internal Land Uses): The ASRP provides for locating residential uses immediately adjacent to commercial uses, which can cause conflicts such as noise from equipment, operations, music, parking and traffic, and the Proposed Project would result in temporary disturbances during construction.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-1: Construction Noise Reduction is set forth in full in Section 3.8.6 in relation to Impact 4.6-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-2: Commercial Noise Controls is set forth in full in Section 3.8.6 in relation to Impact 4.6-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Measures to Reduce Short-term Construction-related Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-1.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Commercial and Business Professional Uses

The ASRP includes 27.3 acres associated with a Community Commercial Village District and 23.9 acres associated with Community Commercial. All Community Commercial uses would be located off of Westbrook Boulevard. The City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines includes specific requirements for commercial development, multi-family residential and compact residential development. Commercial development adjacent to residential areas must include side and rear setbacks with a sufficient planter area to screen views and/or for the placement of sound barriers or fencing (according to City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, March 2008). The Guidelines also require that lighting sources include cut-off lenses to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties. In addition, the Design Guidelines prepared for the ARSP include specific requirements to ensure that landscaping, building setbacks, and berming would be appropriate to screen noise and other visual intrusions from commercial uses on nearby residential

areas. Further, the ARSP would be required to comply with the Zoning Ordinance, which mandates proper screening, building setbacks, landscaping requirements, and light intensities, which would promote compatibility between residential and adjacent businesses. Mitigation Measure 4.6-2 Commercial Noise Controls, which requires that any commercial development demonstrate that it meets the City noise standards. Therefore, with mitigation this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.1-35)

Temporary Disturbances During Construction

The ASRP would be constructed in phases. Therefore, residents that move during early phases may be subject to construction-related impacts such as noise, dust, and truck traffic over a period of time. In addition, there are two areas of the site plan that propose residential uses adjacent to Placer Parkway. Because Placer Parkway would be constructed in the future likely after residential areas have been occupied, residents would be subject to construction-related impacts such as noise, dust, and truck traffic from construction activities. Potential short-term disturbances associated with construction are addressed in Section 2.4, Air Quality, and Section 2.6, Noise. This is considered a **significant** impact. Mitigation Measure 4.6-1, Construction Noise Reduction (set forth in full in Section 2.6, Noise), and Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, Construction Control Measures (set forth full in Section 2.4, Air Quality) would reduce construction impacts to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.1-38)

Impact 4.1-3 (Potential Incompatibility with Existing Agricultural and Other Land Uses in Placer County and the City of Roseville): Proposed Project may expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors from industrial and municipal uses in the vicinity.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Industrial and municipal uses in the vicinity of the project site include the Roseville Energy Park (REP) and the PGWWTP located two miles south of the project site, and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) operated by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority located approximately 1.8 miles northeast of the project site. Operation of these facilities generates noise and potential odors that may be perceived by sensitive receptors within the project site. Occasionally depending on atmospheric conditions, operations at the PGWWTP, WRSL, and MRF would emit odors that may be detectable within the project site.

Although there are no health standards that regulate odor, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Air Quality Handbook includes a recommended buffer of two miles between residential land uses and sanitary landfills and WWTPs (PCAPCD, 2012). This buffer is intended to be used as a screening tool, not a significance threshold. The proximity of the project site to

odor-generating land uses is closer than the recommended buffer distances. Disclosures will be provided to all buyers and occupants of the project site (as embodied in the CC&Rs), to ensure that residents and property owners are informed of the proximity of the adjacent agricultural uses, the PGWWTP, WRSL, and MRF and the associated potential for occasional nuisance odors. Nonetheless, this is considered a **significant** impact. Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Thus, because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without exposure of sensitive receptors to potential odor nuisances, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible and this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.1-41.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to odorous emissions.

Impact 4.1-5 (Conversion of Agricultural Land to Developed Uses): The Proposed Project would result in the loss of approximately 636 acres of grazing and irrigated pasture lands.

Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 Agricultural Compensation A minimum of 636 acres of open space shall be preserved within Placer County to mitigate for the loss of 636 acres of agricultural and grazing lands. This shall be accomplished through the recordation of conservation easements that result in the formation of preserve lands (each a "mitigation property or "preserve site" and collectively, "mitigation lands" or "preserve lands"). For purposes of mitigation, the term "open space" shall include any and all undeveloped land proposed to be preserved by conservation easement or otherwise required by any governmental agency to be preserved for any reason, specifically including all lands preserved for habitat or agricultural mitigation as set forth below and lands in agricultural use. No additional agricultural mitigation is required beyond the 1:1 open space requirement, as long as a substantial portion of the mitigation lands acquired, as determined by the Development Services Director, are: (1) in agricultural production, (2) undeveloped and have an NRCS soils classification of the same or greater value than lands being affected within the specific plan property at issue, or (3) undeveloped and have the same or higher value DOC categorization as lands being affected within the specific plan property at issue. In-kind mitigation is not required for agricultural land developed within the ARSP project site.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-site and On-site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

While the project site is designated for agricultural use under the County's General Plan, it does not provide opportunities for prime agricultural production. The land is generally unsuitable for agricultural uses beyond grazing. Ninety-four percent of the project site contains soils considered Grade 4 (poor) soils, which have severe limitations for agricultural production. There are no Grade

1 (excellent) soils in the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 and Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 would provide 1:1 ratio mitigation for open space preservation that will ensure that grazing opportunities remain in the region, mitigating this potential impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR p. 4.1-44)

3.8.2. Population and Housing

Impact 4.2-4 (Inducement of Substantial Population Growth): The Proposed Project would accommodate approximately 7,379 additional residents, which represents an approximately six percent increase in the City's current population.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.*

The Proposed Project involves the development of 2,827 residential units in the project site. This new housing could accommodate approximately 7,379 additional residents. This represents an approximately six percent increase in the City's current population. The General Plan anticipates a total of 73,392 dwelling units at buildout. With the implementation of the ARSP, the total number of units in the City would be increased by 2,827 and would require a General Plan amendment; which is part of the Proposed Project. The commercial and business professional uses proposed in the ARSP would generate approximately 1,115 additional jobs. While most of these jobs would be held by City residents, it would be anticipated that some workers would also live outside of the City.

A lead agency should not assume that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment (CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.2, subd. [d]). As a result, the prospect of growth, by itself, does not create an adverse effect on the environment. Instead, growth may result in physical impacts to various kinds of natural or environmental resources, such as air, water, or land. As described in the DEIR, the ARSP will result in a number of significant adverse environmental impacts. As a result, population growth resulting from the ARSP is considered **significant**. While many impacts can be reduced to a less-than- significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this EIR, a number of environmental impacts are unavoidable. Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without impacting on-site population growth, and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible, this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.2-12.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to inducement of population growth.

3.8.3. Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.3-1 (Increased Traffic Volumes on City of Roseville Existing Conditions): The Proposed Project would cause operations to degrade below LOS C for intersections operating at LOS C or better; or cause operations to degrade by one or more service level for intersections operating at LOS D or worse during AM and PM peak hours.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 Roseville Intersections: Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP

The Applicant shall pay fair-share fees toward the following improvements detailed within the CIP:

- **Baseline Road/Fiddyment Road:** Addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane.
- **Cirby Way/Riverside Avenue:** Addition of a third eastbound through lane.
- **Baseline Road/Foothills Road:** Addition of a third northbound through lane.
- **Baseline Road/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard:** Addition of a second eastbound through lane.
- **Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard:** Addition of a third northbound left-turn lane and a third southbound through lane.
- **Cirby Way/Vernon Street**: Addition of a second southbound left-turn lane.
- **Foothills Boulevard/Junction Boulevard:** Addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane.
- **Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard:** Addition of a fourth westbound through lane.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

For AM and PM peak hour conditions, significant impacts are identified for intersections in which the project would cause operations to degrade below LOS C for intersections operating at LOS C or better; or cause operations to degrade by one or more service level for intersections operating at LOS D or worse.

The Proposed Project would cause significant intersection degradation to the below intersections during the AM and PM peak hours. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- Baseline Rd/Fiddyment Rd (LOS C to D)
- Cirby Way/Riverside Ave (LOS C to D)
- Baseline Rd/Foothills Blvd (LOS C to D)
- Baseline Rd/Woodcreek Oaks Blvd (LOS C to D)

PM Peak Hour

- Antelope Creek Blvd/Galleria Blvd (LOS C to D)
- Baseline Rd/Fiddyment Rd (LOS D to E)

- Blue Oaks Road/Foothills Blvd (LOS C to D)
- Cirby Way/Vernon Street (LOS C to D)
- Junction Blvd/Foothills Blvd (LOS C to D)
- Roseville Parkway/Galleria Blvd (LOS D to E)

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would restore operations to an LOS C at the Baseline Road/Fiddyment Road, Baseline Road/Foothills Boulevard, Baseline Road/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard, Cirby Way/Riverside Avenue, Cirby Way/Vernon Street, Foothills Boulevard/Junction Boulevard, and Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard intersections under Existing Plus Project conditions. Each of these improvements is included within the City's CIP, and the Proposed Project's payment of the applicable TMF constitutes a fair-share payment toward these improvements. Therefore, impacts to these intersections would be considered **less than significant**.

The Antelope Creek Boulevard/Galleria Boulevard intersection is constructed to its ultimate lane configuration. Operations are projected to worsen to LOS E under 2035 CIP conditions during the PM peak hour. By virtue of the City Council adopting an exception to the LOS C standard for this intersection, this impact is considered **less than significant**. (DEIR p. 4.3-50)

Impact 4.3-4 (Impacts to Transit): Increased transit demand resulting from the Proposed Project could impact Dial-A-Ride Service.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 Pay Fair Share toward Transit Improvements

The Applicant shall pay its fair share toward the capital improvements for expanded transit services to the project site. This includes bus turn-outs, shelter pads, and shelters.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The addition of residential units and commercial square footage would increase the demand for transit within the City of Roseville. There are currently no Local Service routes directly serving the project site.

Roseville Transit is funded primarily by local Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding sources, which are derived from a statewide one-quarter cent sales tax. Additional funding sources include Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds and local transit fares. General funds are not used to support Roseville Transit and are not expected to be used to support transit services for the Proposed Project. As TDA revenues rise or fall during various economic conditions, transit services are expected to reflect the amount of funding available in consideration of the unmet transit needs which are evaluated annually by PCTPA.

Due to funding constraints it is anticipated that Local Service (and thus ADA Paratransit Service) will not be extended to the project site upon initial development. Roseville Transit regularly reviews and, as needed and feasible, adjusts its services in consideration of unmet transit needs

within the City of Roseville, the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the SRTP and available funding. Future service adjustments may include service to the ARSP area. Until that time, Dial-A-Ride Service is the only transit service that will be available to the project site. As a result, the increased transit demand resulting from the project could impact Dial–A-Ride Service due to extended travel times and increased demand. This would result in a **potentially significant** impact to existing transit services, as well as a **potentially significant** impact to future residents within the project site due to unmet transit demand.

Pursuant to **Mitigation Measure 4.3-2, Pay Fair Share toward Transit Improvements**, the project would be required to create transit stops at key arterial intersections and at other locations as determined by the Public Works Director, in accordance with the City's Improvement Standards. Roseville Transit will provide transit services in accordance with the SRTP and LRTP as funding allows. The requirement that the Proposed Project develop transit stops at key arterial intersections and other locations determined by Public Works will be sufficient to allow service to be extended to the project site. Payment of a fair share fee is proposed that will enable transit services to be extended to the project site, and will ensure that existing services are expanded to account for the increased demand on existing services that would result from development of the Proposed Project. For these reasons, Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 would reduce impacts to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR p. 4.3-54)

Impact 4.3-5 (Increased Traffic Volumes at Intersections Within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Under Existing Conditions): Increased Traffic Volumes at Intersections Within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Under Existing Conditions

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share Costs to Placer County Intersection Improvements

The Applicant shall pay the fair share cost of improvements to restore acceptable operations during peak hours at the following intersections:

a) **Watt Avenue/PFE Road:** Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. This improvement is included in the Placer County CIP (December 2014).
b) **Walerga Road/PFE Road:** Widening of Walerga Road to four lanes through the intersection, to consist of two northbound and two southbound travel lanes. The Placer County Countywide CIP (December 2014) includes funding ROW acquisition for the widening of Walerga Road to six lanes from Baseline Road to the Sacramento County line. However, funding for construction is not provided.
c) **Cook-Riolo Road/PFE Road Intersection:** Development of capacity-enhancing improvements identified by Placer County. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.

d) **Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard:** Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.
e) **Fiddyment Road/Athens Avenue:** Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.
f) **Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard:** The addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.
g) **Fiddyment Road/Athens Avenue:** The addition of a second westbound left-turn lane to the intersection. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.
h) **N Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue:** Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.

Consistent with Placer County's Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and Mitigation Measure 6.12-1 for the Regional University Specific Plan, the City of Roseville, in working with Placer County to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with Placer County to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the ARSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the ARSP for significant impacts on Placer County roadways. In reaching an accommodation with Placer County, the City and Placer County, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the City strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the City shall insist that "fair share" fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the ARSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the City's transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just Placer County or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.

The City intends that its arrangement(s) with Placer County and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements (e.g., the

Curry Creek Community Plan in Placer County), (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs.

The City will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the County regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-4 Sutter County Facilities: Pay Fair Share Costs to Sutter County Intersection Improvements

The Applicant shall pay the fair share costs of improvements to restore acceptable operations during peak hours at the following intersections:

a) **Pleasant Grove Road N/Riego Road**: Widening of Riego Road to four lanes through the intersection, to consist of two eastbound and two westbound travel lanes. This improvement is not included in any known fee program.
b) **Pleasant Grove Road S/Riego Road**: Widening of Riego Road to four lanes through the intersection, to consist of two eastbound and two westbound travel lanes. This improvement is not included in any known fee program.

The City of Roseville shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a fair agreement with Sutter County regarding the ARSP's fair share mitigation for these improvements. In reaching an accommodation with Sutter County, the City and Sutter County, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Placer County, Sacramento County, and Caltrans. As the City strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the City shall insist that "fair share" fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the ARSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the City's transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just Sutter County or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels. The City intends that its arrangement(s) with Sutter County and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing

to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements (e.g., the Curry Creek Community Plan in Placer County), (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, these improvements lie outside the jurisdiction of the City of Roseville.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The Proposed Project would cause significant intersection degradations to the below Placer County intersections during the AM and PM peak hours. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- Watt Avenue/PFE Road (LOS E to F)
- Walerga Road/PFE Road (LOS D to E)
- Cook-Riolo/PFE Road (LOS B to D)
- Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard (LOS B to F)

PM Peak Hour

- Walerga Road/PFE Road (LOS C to D)
- Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard (LOS C to F)
- Fiddyment Road/Athens Avenue (LOS B to E)

Mitigation Measures 4.3-3 and 4.3-4 would restore intersection operations to acceptable levels at the Placer and Sutter County intersections. Implementation of these measures will facilitate the construction of such improvements by requiring the City of Roseville to negotiate in good faith with Sutter County to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving within a reasonable time period after approval of the Proposed Project, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the Proposed Project for impacts on Placer and Sutter County roadways. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (a) is fully funded through an adopted fee program and is therefore considered feasible. Since this would restore acceptable operations during the AM and PM peak hours, it would mitigate the intersection impacts at Watt Avenue/PFE Road to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (b) is also in a fee program. However, the fee program only covers ROW acquisition and not funding for construction. Mitigation Measures 4.3-3 (b) through (e) and 4.3-4 (a) and (b) would require the City of Roseville to negotiate in good faith with Placer County to

identify the Proposed Project's fair share funding contribution. These mitigations would require ROW acquisition and approvals from other agencies.

However, since none of these improvements are included and fully funded in an existing fee program, there is no assurance that the remaining funds necessary for construction will be collected. As such, the operational impact to the identified intersections would remain **significant and unavoidable.**

This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation of the proposed improvements on Placer County and Sutter County roadways is outside the control of the City of Roseville. For this reason, the City of Roseville is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with Placer County and Sutter County, mutually acceptable accommodations may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation. The City would not have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 and Mitigation Measure 4.3-4. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 and Mitigation Measure 4.3-4, which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR 4.3-55)

Impact 4.3-6 (Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways Within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin Under Existing Conditions): The Proposed Project would cause operational degradations to roadway segments in Placer County and Sacramento County.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share Costs to Placer County Intersection Improvements is set forth in full in Section 3.4.3 in relation to Impact 4.3-5.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 Placer County Segments: Pay Fair Share Costs to Placer County Facilities

The Applicant shall pay its fair share costs of improvements to restore acceptable operations on the following roadway segments:

a) **Walerga Road between Baseline Road and PFE Road:** Widening of this roadway to four lanes, consisting of two continuous northbound and southbound travel lanes. The Placer County Countywide Traffic Fee Program (December 2014) includes funding for ROW acquisition for the widening of Walerga Road to size lanes from Baseline to the Sacramento County line. However, funding for construction is not provided.
b) **West Sunset Boulevard between Fiddyment Road and Westbrook Boulevard:** Widening of this roadway to include four lanes. However, only two travel lanes are necessary (based on travel demand) upon construction of Placer Parkway. Therefore, Placer County may request that the fair share contribution cover roadway widening for

dedicated turn lanes and/or shoulders, capacity widening, or a contribution toward the construction of Placer Parkway. It should be noted that consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.3-7, the Proposed Project is required to contribute to the construction of Placer Parkway through payment of the SPRTA fees. Improvements to West Sunset Boulevard are not included in any existing fee program.

c) **Fiddyment Road from Athens Avenue to West Sunset Boulevard:** Widening of this roadway to six lanes. This improvement is not included in any existing fee program.

The City shall determine the means of providing the ARSP's fair share to fund these improvements with Placer County through the inter-agency agreement or other arrangement required by Mitigation Measure 4.3-3. Widening of Walerga Road south of Baseline to six lanes is identified in the Dry Creek Community Plan.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 Sacramento County Segments: Pay Fair Share Costs to Sacramento County Facilities

The Applicant shall pay their fair share cost of improvements to restore operations on the following roadway segment:

- **Walerga Road between PFE Road and Singing Tree Way:** Widening of this roadway to four lanes, consisting of two northbound and southbound travel lanes. The Sacramento County General Plan Circulation Element (amended 2011) shows this segment of Walerga Road as a planned four-lane road. However, the Final Report for the Sacramento County Development Transportation Impact Fee Program (2010) does not include this widening in the fee program.

Consistent with Placer County's Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and Mitigation Measure 6.12-1 for the Regional University Specific Plan, which require Placer County to attempt to enter into an agreement with Sacramento County in order to mitigate the significant effects of the those two Placer County projects within Sacramento County, the City of Roseville shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a fair agreement with Sacramento County regarding the ARSP's fair share mitigation for this improvement. In reaching an accommodation with Sacramento County, the City and Sacramento County, in order to better ensure an effective subregional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Placer County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the City strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the City shall insist that "fair share" fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the ARSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the City's transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just Sacramento County or with additional agencies, shall account for

existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels. The City intends that its arrangement(s) with Sacramento County and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, these improvements lie outside the jurisdiction of the City of Roseville.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The Proposed Project would cause significant roadway segment degradations to the below Placer County roadway. This is considered a **significant** impact.

- Walerga Road south of Baseline Road (LOS E to F)

The Proposed Project would cause significant roadway segment degradations to the below Sacramento County roadway. This is considered a **significant** impact.

- Walerga Road south of PFE Road (LOS F operations exacerbated by a 0.07 v/c ratio increase)

Mitigation Measures 4.3-5 would restore operations on Walerga Road south of Baseline Road to LOS A through the construction of a second northbound and southbound through lane. The City of Roseville currently participates in a joint fee program with Placer County for improvements along Walerga Road, including the construction of this improvement along with other improvements consistent with the Dry Creek Specific Plan, which includes the widening of Walerga Road to four lanes south of Baseline Road. Development within the project site will be required to participate in this fee program and pay fair share costs for this improvement consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 and 4.3-5.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 would restore operations on Walerga Road south of PFE Road to LOS A through facilitating the construction of a second northbound and southbound through lane by requiring the City to negotiate in good faith with Sacramento County to enter into fair and

reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving within a reasonable time period after approval of the Proposed Project, a commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the Proposed Project for impacts on Sacramento County roadways.

Construction of improvements described in Mitigation Measures 4.3-3, 4.3-5, and 4.3-6 would reduce project impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, since the City does not have control over improvements on Placer or Sacramento County roadways, the City must conservatively assume that, at the time of project approval by the City, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer and Sacramento Counties. The City would not have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-3, 4.3-5 and Mitigation Measure 4.3-6. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the a fair share fee program to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under the County's control. The City is committed to and will initiate contact with Placer and Sacramento County officials to explore the feasibility of such a program, wherein the effects of development across jurisdictional boundaries are addressed. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-3, 4.3-5 and Mitigation Measure 4.3-6, which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. If adopted, mitigation requires the Proposed Project to be made part of such a fee program. (DEIR 4.3-58)

Impact 4.3-8 (Increased Traffic Volumes on Existing State Highways Under Existing Conditions): Increased traffic volumes under Existing Plus Project Conditions would result in degradation of operations on freeway segments on SR 65.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 State Facilities: Payment of Fees for State Roadway Segments

No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts on I-80 or SR 65; however, the City is willing to work with Caltrans & the PCTPA to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on these facilities. If and when Caltrans and the City enter into an enforceable agreement, the Proposed Project shall pay impact fees to the City of Roseville in amounts that constitute the Proposed Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements, consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, § 66000 et seq.).

The City shall determine the means of providing the project's fair share of the funds for these improvements to Caltrans through the inter-agency agreement or other arrangement.

The Applicant shall pay the Highway 65 JPA fee and the SPRTA fee. The Highway 65 JPA Fee assesses fees on new development for the cost of interchange improvements along SR 65. The SPRTA Fee provides funding for regional projects such as the SR 65 Widening Project and Placer Parkway.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Degradation of a freeway segment from an acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) to an unacceptable LOS (LOS F) as a result of the Proposed Project would be considered a significant impact. Additionally, impacts are identified when a freeway segment already operating at an unacceptable level is worsened to a significant degree. Therefore, impacts to the SR 65 freeway segments identified above are considered **significant**.

AM Peak Hour

- SB SR 65 weave from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- SB SR 65 diagonal on-ramp at Pleasant Grove Boulevard (LOS E to F)
- SB SR 65 off-ramp at Galleria Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbated)

PM Peak Hour

- NB SR 65 from I-80 to Galleria Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- NB SR 65 off-ramp at Galleria Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbate)
- NB SR 65 on-ramp at Galleria Boulevard (LOS E to F)
- NB SR 65 off-ramp at Pleasant Grove Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- SB SR 65 weave from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard (LOS F operations exacerbated)

Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 would reduce impacts on the above-listed freeway segments to acceptable levels by requiring the Applicant to pay the Highway 65 JPA and the SPRTA fees. The Highway 65 JPA Fee assesses fees on new development for the cost of interchange improvements along SR 65. The SPRTA Fee provides funding for regional projects such as the SR 65 Widening Project and Placer Parkway. However, the remaining funding necessary to construct such improvements remains unidentified. No improvements within the SR 65 study area are included in the Tier 1 project list in SACOG's MTP/SCS. The PCTPA website indicates that funding is currently being sought for the SR 65 Widening Project. Without funding for the SR 65 Widening Project, mitigation to less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow the Proposed Project without impacting the identified freeway segments and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is infeasible, impacts to SR 65 would remain **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.3-61.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to increased highway traffic volumes.

Impact 4.3-9 (Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections Under 2035 CIP Conditions): Increased traffic volumes under 2035 CIP Plus Project Conditions would cause intersection degradations during the AM and PM peak hours at specific intersections.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 Roseville Intersections: Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP is set forth in full in Section 3.8.3 in relation to Impact 4.3.1.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-8 City of Roseville Facilities: Update the City of Roseville Capital Improvement Plan

The City of Roseville shall modify its CIP to include the following improvements:

- **Blue Oaks Boulevard/Westbrook Boulevard:** Provide two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right turn lane on all approaches and operate the westbound right-turn movement with an overlap phase.
- **Westbrook Boulevard/Vista Grande Boulevard:** Redesign the westbound approach (currently proposed to consist of one left-turn, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane) to be striped to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.

Once the CIP is modified, the Applicant shall pay fair-share fees toward such improvements.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

For AM and PM peak hour conditions, significant impacts are identified for intersections in which the Proposed Project would cause operations to degrade below LOS C for intersections operating at LOS C or better; or cause operations to degrade by one or more service level for intersections operating at LOS D or worse.

The Proposed Project would cause cumulatively significant degradations to the below intersections during the AM and PM peak hours. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- McAnally Drive/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (LOS C to D)
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Westbrook Boulevard (LOS C to E)

PM Peak Hour

- Roseville Parkway/Gibson Drive (LOS D to E)
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Westbrook Boulevard (LOS C to F)
- Baseline Road/Santucci Boulevard (LOS C to D)
- Westbrook Boulevard/Vista Grande Boulevard (LOS C to D)
- Baseline Road/Westbrook Boulevard (LOS C to D)

Mitigation Measure 4.3-8 would restore operations at the Blue Oaks Boulevard/Westbrook Boulevard and Westbrook Boulevard/Vista Grande Boulevard intersections to acceptable levels of service through addition of intersection improvements to the City's CIP. These intersection improvements, as described in Mitigation Measure 4.3-8 would restore the Blue Oaks Boulevard/Westbrook Boulevard intersection to LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours and restore the Westbrook Boulevard/Vista Grande Boulevard intersection to LOS C during PM peak hour. Further, Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would require the Applicant to pay fair share costs of improvements in the City's CIP. Therefore, impacts to these intersections would be **less than significant**.

In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures are available to mitigate for the remaining impacted intersections. The City's CIP includes an additional westbound approach lane at the McAnally Drive/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard intersection. Further widening is not possible at this intersection due to the surrounding land uses. However, operations at this intersection would be restored to LOS C under the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project scenario (Impact 4.3-14 set forth below) due primarily to traffic shifts caused by Placer Parkway. The Proposed Project would cause a three-second increase in delay during the PM peak hour at Roseville Parkway/Gibson Drive, which would degrade operations from LOS D to E. This intersection is built to its ultimate design and signal timing adjustments would not restore operations back to LOS D. However, operations are restored to LOS D under the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project scenario (Impact 4.3-14 set forth below). The Proposed Project would cause a two- to three-second increase in delay at both the Baseline Road/Santucci Boulevard and Baseline Road/Westbrook Boulevard intersections during the PM peak hour; operations are degraded from LOS C to D. Both intersections are planned to include two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane on all approaches. Further widening is not possible and signal timing adjustments would not restore operations back to LOS C. However, intersection operations are restored to LOS C at each intersection under the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project scenario (Impact 4.3-14 below) due primarily to traffic shifts caused by Placer Parkway. Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without impacting the McAnally Drive/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, Roseville Parkway/Gibson Drive, Baseline Road/Santucci Boulevard, Baseline Road/Westbrook Boulevard intersections and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible, impact to these four intersections is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR 4.3-64.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to this impact.

Impact 4.3-11 (Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County or City of Lincoln Intersections Under 2035 CIP Conditions): Traffic volumes from the Proposed

Project would cause intersection degradation to identified Placer County facilities during the AM and PM peak hours.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c), (f), (g), and (h) Placer County Intersections: Pay Fair Share Costs to Placer County Intersection Improvements is set forth in full in Section 3.8.3 in relation to Impact 4.3-5.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The Proposed Project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in surrounding jurisdictions under 2035 CIP Conditions. The Proposed Project would cause significant intersection degradations to the below Placer County Facilities during the AM and PM peak hours. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- Cook-Riolo/PFE Road (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- N. Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue (LOS F operations exacerbated)

PM Peak Hour

- Cook-Riolo/PFE Road (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard (LOS A to E)
- Fiddyment Road/Athens Avenue (LOS E to F)
- N. Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue (LOS F operations exacerbated)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (c) would reduce impacts at the Cook-Riolo/PFE Road intersection. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (f) would restore operations at the Fiddyment Road/West Sunset Boulevard to LOS C during the PM peak hour. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (g) would restore operations at the Fiddyment Road/Athens Avenue intersection to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (h) would restore operations at the N. Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue intersection to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour. Thus, impacts to these intersections would be reduced to **less-than-significant** levels.

However, since the City does not have jurisdiction over the improvements on Placer County intersections, the City must conservatively assume that, this impact remains **significant and unavoidable**, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County. The

Furthermore, since none of these improvements are included in an existing fee program, there is no assurance that the remaining funds necessary for construction will be collected. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. The City would not have control or authority

over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c), (f), (g) and (h). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the fair share fee program to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under the County's control. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c), (f), (g), and (h) which would mitigate this potential impact to a less than significant level. (DEIR p. 4.3-75)

Impact 4.3-12 (Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County or City of Rocklin Under 2035 CIP Conditions): Increased traffic volumes under 2035 CIP Conditions would cause roadway segment degradations to specific Placer County facilities.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-5(b) and (c) is set forth in full in Section 3.8.3 in relation to Impact 4.3-6.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The Proposed Project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in surrounding jurisdictions under 2035 CIP Conditions. The Proposed Project would cause cumulatively significant roadway degradations to the below Placer County facilities. This is considered a **significant** impact.

- West Sunset Boulevard between Westbrook Boulevard and Fiddyment Road (LOS A to E)
- Fiddyment Road from Athens Avenue to Sunset Bouleavrd West (LOS E to F)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 (b) and (c) would restore operations on these roadway segments to acceptable levels of service by requiring the Applicant's fair share funding contribution. However, since the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County facilities and the remaining fair share costs required for construction have not been identified, the City must conservatively assume that this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County. The City would have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-5(b) and (c). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the fair share fee program to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under Placer County's control. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-5(b) and (c) which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR p. 4.3-77)

Impact 4.3-15 (Increased Traffic on City of Roseville Intersections Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions): The Proposed Project would result in operational degradation at specific intersections during the PM peak hour under 2035 cumulative conditions.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Proposed Project would cause cumulatively significant degradations to the intersections identified above during the PM peak hour. This is considered a **significant impact**.

PM Peak Hour

- Blue Oaks Blvd/Collector C (LOS C to D)
- Blue Oaks Blvd/Washington Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps (LOS D to E
- Eureka Rd/Taylor Rd/I-80 EB Ramps (LOS D to E)

Blue Oaks Boulevard/Collector

The planned Blue Oaks Boulevard/Collector C intersection would be located approximately 1,175 feet west of the Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard intersection. The Proposed Project would add approximately 300 eastbound through vehicles during the PM peak hour. The Traffic Study predicted that queued vehicles on the eastbound Blue Oaks Boulevard approach would spill back through this intersection, thereby causing the LOS D condition. Due to the level of project-added traffic and the degree of delay increase (32 to 55 seconds), it is unlikely that signal timing modifications would restore operations to LOS C. Further, no additional widening beyond what is assumed is possible.

Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 SB Ramps

The Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 SB Ramps intersection was modified within the last two years to add additional capacity. The 2035 Cumulative scenario assumes additional planned widening, and no additional widening beyond what was assumed is possible.

Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 EB Ramps

The Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 EB Ramps intersection was rebuilt within the last three years to add additional capacity. A second westbound right-turn lane is planned on Taylor Road, which is assumed in-place for the 2035 Cumulative scenario. No additional widening at this intersection is possible.

Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow for development of the Proposed Project without impacting the Blue Oaks Boulevard/Collector C, Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington

Boulevard/SR 65 SB Ramps, or Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 EB Ramps intersections and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, impact to these intersections would be **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.3-82.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related increased traffic on City of Roseville intersections under 2035 cumulative conditions.

Impact 4.3-17 (Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions): The Proposed Project would result in operational degradation at two intersections in Placer County during the AM peak hour under 2035 cumulative conditions.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c) and (h) is set forth in full in Section 3.8.3 in relation to Impact 4.3-5.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The Proposed Project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of intersections in surrounding jurisdictions under 2035 Cumulative Conditions. The Proposed Project would cause significant intersection degradations to the below Placer County facilities during the AM peak hour. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- Cook Riolo Rd/PFE Rd (LOS F operations exacerbated)
- N. Foothills Blvd/Athens Avenue (LOS F operations exacerbated)

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c) would reduce impacts at the Cook-Riolo Road/PFE Road intersection under 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(h) would restore operations at the N. Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue intersection to LOS A during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour under 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. However, these improvements are not included in any existing fee program. Further, this mitigation requires the City of Roseville to negotiate in good faith with Placer County to identify the Proposed Project's fair share funding contribution. Because the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County facilities, the City must conservatively assume that the impact to Cook Riolo Road/PFE Road and N. Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue intersections would be **significant and unavoidable**, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County. The City would not have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c) and (h). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(c) and (h) which would reduce impacts or mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR 4.3-92)

Impact 4.3-20 (Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways Under 2035 Cumulative Conditions): Increased traffic volumes from the Proposed Project would result in freeway operation degradation during the AM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 State Facilities: Payment of Fees for State Roadway Segments is set forth in full in Section 3.8.3 in relation to Impact 4.3-8.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Proposed Project would cause cumulatively significant free segment degradations to the below Caltrans facilities. This is considered a **significant** impact.

AM Peak Hour

- SB SR 65 from Ferrari Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (LOS E to F)
- SB SR 65 from Twelve Bridges Drive to Placer Parkway (LOS E to F)

Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 would reduce impacts on the above-listed freeway segments to acceptable levels by requiring the Applicant to pay the Highway 65 JPA and the SPRTA fees. The Highway 65 JPA Fee assesses fees on new development for the cost of interchange improvements along SR 65 and the SPRTA fee provide funding for regional projects such as the SR 65 Widening and Placer Parkway. However, the remaining funding necessary to construct the SR 65 Widening Project has not been identified. No improvements within the SR 65 study area are included in the Tier 1 project list in SACOG's MTP/SCS. Without funding for the improvements identified in Mitigation Measure 4.3-7, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing implementation for the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without impacting the identified freeway segments and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is infeasible, impacts to SR 65 would remain **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.3-61.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations," the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to increased highway traffic volumes.

3.8.4. Air Quality

Impact 4.4-1 (Generate Short-Term Construction Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants): Emission of construction-related criteria air pollutants could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Measures to Reduce Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions requires the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce short-term construction-related air quality impacts:

a. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, (whichever occurs first), on project sites greater than five acres, the Applicant shall submit to PCAPCD a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan within 30 days prior to groundbreaking. If the PCAPCD does not respond within 20 days, the plan shall be considered approved. The applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by the PCAPCD, to the City that the plan has been submitted to PCAPCD. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to deliver the approved plan to the local jurisdiction. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving District approval of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit, unless the PCAPCD does not respond within 20 days of submission of the plan, and the plan is deemed approved.
b. The following shall be included in the Dust Control Plan:
    - During construction, emissions of fugitive dust from any active operation, open storage pile, or disturbed surface area, shall be controlled so that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the boundary line of the emission source.
    - When wind speeds result in dust emissions crossing the property line, and despite the application of dust control measures, grading and earthmoving operations shall be suspended and inactive disturbed surface areas shall be stabilized.
    - Fugitive dust generated by active operations, open storage piles, or from a disturbed surface area shall not result in such opacity as to obscure an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke as dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringlemann Chart (or 40 percent opacity).
    - All exposed soils be watered a minimum of once every two hours of active operation or sufficiently often to keep the area adequately wetted.
    - Any visible track-out on a paved road where vehicles enter and exit the work area must be removed at the end of the workday or at least on time per day. Removal shall be accomplished by using wet sweeping or a HEPA filter equipped vacuum device. Dirt from vehicles exiting shall be removed through the use of a gravel pad, a tire shaker, a wheel wash system, or a pavement extending for not less than 50 feet from the intersection with the paved public road.

c. Include the following standard note on the Grading or Improvement Plan: The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the

inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the PCAPCD prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name and phone number of the property owner, project manager and on-site foreman.

d. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the PCAPCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or greater) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction as required by CARB. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.
e. In order to control dust, operational watering trucks shall be on-site during construction hours. In addition, dry, mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Watering of a construction site shall be carried out in compliance with all pertinent PCAPCD rules (or as required by ordinance within each local jurisdiction).
f. Include the following standard notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan:
    - During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
    - During construction the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.
g. Signs shall be posted in the designated queing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling time is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Construction-related emissions are intermittent and temporary in nature. Construction-related activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants (PM10 and PM2.5) and ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) from site preparation (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing), off- road equipment, material transport, and worker vehicles, vehicle travel on unpaved roads, paving, and application of architectural coatings.

Emissions of fugitive PM10 and PM2.5 are associated primarily with earth-moving activities during site preparation and grading. The generation of dust during construction activities could adversely affect sensitive receptors and construction workers by exacerbating existing respiratory

problems such as asthma. Dust can also adversely affect children and the elderly who are more susceptible to respiratory illnesses. The quantity of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions vary with the soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and on- and off-site vehicle miles traveled. Exhaust from diesel equipment and worker commute trips contribute to project-related PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. Emissions of ozone precursors (NOx and ROG) are emitted by off-road construction equipment exhaust. Worker commute trips and other construction-related activities (application of architectural coatings, such as paint) also contribute to project-related construction emissions.

Construction-related air quality impacts were determined by comparing project-related emissions with applicable PCAPCD significance thresholds. Unmitigated construction-related activities would result in ROG and NOx emissions that exceed PCAPCD's significance thresholds of 82 lb/day; therefore, construction-related criteria air pollutants emissions could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This is considered a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 specifies dust and construction control measures that would reduce emissions from construction activities. ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be reduced with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, but ROG and NO_x emissions would not be reduced to levels that are below PCAPCD thresholds. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is not possible to allow development of the Proposed Project without short-term impacts to air quality and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible, this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR, p. 4.4-26.) As explained in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to construction-related emissions.

Impact 4.4-2 (Generate Long-Term Operational Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants): NO_x, ROG and PM_{10} emissions from area, energy, and mobile sources associated with operation of the Proposed Project at full buildout would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds of 82 pounds per day. Emissions from stationary sources would be additive to mobile source emissions, which exceed PCAPCD thresholds for NO_x, ROG and PM_{10}.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions

Following receipt of an application for a Tentative Map (excluding the Large Lot Subdivision Map), Design Review Permit, conditional use permits and/or any other discretionary permits, the City will forward an early consultation notice to the PCAPCD. Where the PCAPCD provides comments on a specific development proposal, the City shall consult with PCAPCD and the developer to incorporate measures recommended by the PCAPCD and agreed to by the City into the project. Where the PCAPCD does not provide comment on a specific development proposal,

the City shall incorporate measures that reduce vehicle emissions and operation emissions from the proposed development. This measure will be implemented through project design, conditions of approval, noticing and disclosure statements, or through the City's plan check and inspection processes. This process is intended to ensure that best available and practical approaches are used to reduce operational emissions in specific tentative map and design review permit applications. The following is a listing of measures that shall be implemented for the purpose of reducing vehicle and operational emissions, unless the applicant provides an analysis that demonstrates to the City's satisfaction that the measure is infeasible or other measure is comparably effective. If the applicant demonstrates that any particular measure in the list below is infeasible for a proposed project to which it would otherwise be applicable, the applicant must provide an analysis supported by substantial evidence demonstrating that a replacement measure is comparably effective.

- Provide tree plantings that meet or exceed the requirements of the City's Community Design Guidelines to provide shading of buildings and parking lots.
- Landscape with native drought-resistant plants (ground covers, shrubs and trees) with particular consideration of plantings that are not reliant on gas-powered landscape maintenance equipment.
- Require all flat roofs on non-residential structures to have a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demand.
- Provide conductive/inductive electric vehicle charging station and signage prohibiting parking for non-electric vehicles within designated spaces within non-residential developments.
- Provide vanpool parking only spaces and preferential parking for carpools to accommodate carpools and vanpools in employment areas (e.g. community commercial, business-professional uses)
- All truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208 volt power outlet for every two-dock doors. Signs shall be posted stating "Diesel trucks are prohibited from idling more than five minutes and trucks requiring auxiliary power shall connect to the 110/208-vot outlets to run auxiliary equipment".
- Design streets to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops.
- Require site design to maximize access to transit lines, to accommodate bus travel, and to provide lighted shelters at transit access points.
- Develop the plan consistent with the higher residential densities (within approved residential density ranges of zone) provided around the village nodes and transit corridors.
- Participate in Roseville Electric incentive programs for energy-efficient development where feasible if available at the time of construction.
- Ten percent of the residential units shall be designated as low to very-low income residential units.
- A pedestrian access network shall link areas of the project site with other land uses.

- Electric landscape maintenance equipment shall be utilized to the extent feasible on parks and public/quasi-public lands.
- Design buildings to meet the 2013 Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards (which is a 25% reduction below 2010 Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards).
- Ensure that all area lighting installed on the site shall be considered high efficiency lighting. All public street lighting shall meet the lighting standards of Roseville Electric at the time of construction.
- Utilize reclaimed water for irrigation of all non-single family areas within the project site, including the school, parks, paseos, roadway landscaping and commercial landscaping.
- Reduce the area of turf allowed consistent with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and the Water Conservation Strategy (see Appendix G).
- Install water efficient landscape irrigation systems at all public land uses.

Measures for Residential Units:

- Require electrical outlets be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of residences to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.
- Require every garage of each single family home to be considered "Electric Vehicle Ready". This by definition is not limited to, but includes a conduit raceway to a spare electric box in the garage that is sized for a future minimum 50-amp 220v outlet. A 220v breaker space must be available in the electrical panel.
- Require installation of a gas outlet in the rear of residential buildings for use of outdoor cooking appliances, such as gas burning barbeques.
- Require installation of low NOx hot water heaters (beyond District Rule 246 requirements)
- Prior to approval of Tentative Maps: provide notice to homebuyers through CC&Rs or other mechanisms to inform them that only gas fireplaces are permitted.
- The applicant shall ensure that builders offer only energy efficient appliances for installation in residential units, including Energy Star refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans.
- Prior to building permit approval, the applicant shall show, on the plans submitted to the Building Department, provisions for construction of new residences, and where natural gas is available, the installation of a gas outlet for use with outdoor cooking appliances, such as a gas barbecue or outdoor recreational fire pits.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 Off-Site Mitigation for Operational Emissions

Prior to the issuance of building permits, in order to mitigate the contribution to long-term emissions of pollutants, subject to the PCAPCD's review and approval, the applicant shall either:

a. Establish mitigation on-site by incorporating design features within the project. This may include, but not be limited to: "green" building features such solar panels, energy efficient heating and cooling, exceeding Title 24 standards, bike lanes, bus shelters, etc as described in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3. The specific amounts of "credits" received shall be established and coordinated through the PCACPD; or
b. Establish mitigation off-site within the same region (i.e., east or west Placer County) by participating in an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the District. Examples include, but are not limited to: participation in a "Biomass" program that provides emissions benefits; retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., buses, construction equipment, on road haulers); or other programs that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions; or
c. Participate in the District's Offsite Mitigation Program (Resolution Number 01-06) by paying fees equal to the project's contribution of pollutants (ROG and NOx) in excess of the threshold of 82 lbs per day. The estimated payment for the Proposed Project is $885,870 based on a rate of $18,260 per ton for a one year period. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied pursuant to current California Air Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map or issuance of Building Permits; or
d. Any combination of a, b, or c, calculated to reduce or off-set the project's emissions above thresholds, and as determined feasible by the Director of the PCAPCD.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Area and Mobile Source Emissions

Project-related NO_x, ROG and PM_{10} emissions from area and mobile sources would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds of 82 pounds per day. Therefore, area and mobile source emissions from project operation would result in a **significant impact** to air quality.

The project design is consistent with SACOG's Blueprint planning principles and incorporates new urbanism design concepts that increase the walkability and accessibility of land uses and results in land uses that are more proximate to one another and accessible to services and jobs. A new urbanism community such as this is more accessible by non-automotive transportation methods i.e., walking, bicycling) than a more conventional suburban community, and thus results in fewer project-wide vehicle miles traveled than a more conventional community.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 would establish mitigation on-site by incorporating design features within the project including but not limited to "green" building features such solar panels, energy efficient heating and cooling, exceeding Title 24 standards, bike lanes, and bus shelters. However, as shown in Table 4.4-8, it is estimated that project related emissions would still exceed PCAPCD recommended significance thresholds after on-site mitigation. Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 is

recommended to off-set project emissions by establishing mitigation off-site or through participation in PCAPCD's mitigation program. While Mitigation Measures 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 would reduce operational emissions, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow for development of the Proposed Project without exceeding PCAPCD recommended significance threshold for criteria air pollutants and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be facially infeasible, this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to criteria air pollutants from area and mobile sources.

Stationary Source Emissions

The Proposed Project may include commercial stationary sources of pollutants that would be required to obtain permits to operate under PCAPCD Rule 501-General Permit Requirements and Rule 507-Federal Operating Permit Program. These sources include, but are not limited to, diesel-engine generators for emergency power generation; central heating boilers; kitchen equipment in restaurants; and dry cleaning equipment. The permit process would assure that these sources would be equipped with the required emission controls and individually would comply with permitting requirements. However, collectively, these stationary sources would be additive with the above-described area and mobile source emissions estimates. This would result in a **significant** impact.

As described above, Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 would establish mitigation on-site through design features, and Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 is recommended to off-set project emissions by establishing mitigation off-site through participation in PCAPCD's mitigation program. Mitigation Measures 4.4-2 and 4.4-3 represent all feasible mitigation. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. PCAPCD recommended significance threshold for criteria air pollutants and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be facially infeasible, this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.4-29.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to criteria air pollutants from stationary sources.

Impact 4.4-4 (Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants): The Community Commercial areas within the project site could include facilities that would emit TACs, such as fueling stations, in close proximity to proposed or existing sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 Screen Health Risks

a. The siting of proposed land use types, including fueling facilities and other stationary source/industrial land use types, within the project site shall meet the minimum screening

buffer recommendations within the applicable CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook in effect at the time of building permit issuance. Within the current (April 2005) Handbook, this would require that sensitive land uses, including residential and school uses, be located greater than 50 feet from the fence line of typical gas dispensing facilities, and greater than 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities, defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater.

b. For projects that include stationary sources of air pollutants or TACs e.g., gasoline dispensing facility, auto painting, dry cleaning, large HVAC units, etc.), a copy of the Authority to Construct (ATC) permit from PCAPCD shall be provided to the City prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The Community Commercial areas within the project site could include facilities that would emit TACs, such as fueling stations, in close proximity to proposed or existing sensitive receptors. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 requires that any large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) to be established within the project site be located a certain distance from proposed sensitive receptors that meets the applicable CARB Land Use Planning Handbook recommendations. Under the current CARB Land Use Planning Handbook, this would require a separate of 300 feet. Additionally, any future proposed facility or equipment that may emit pollutants from a stationary source into the atmosphere must first obtain an Authority to Construct permit from the PCAPCD. The PCAPCD reviews each proposed use and if it is determined that there are potential risks, a risk assessment and menu of site specific measures that would lessen impacts associated with TACs would be required. The PCAPCD issues permits and monitors new and modified sources of air pollutants to ensure compliance with national, state, and local emission standards that govern TAC sources. Therefore, because new sensitive land uses within the project site, including the elementary school, would meet the siting recommendations within the CARB Land Use Planning Handbook with respect to buffer distances from potential TAC sources, and future sources of TACs would be subject to compliance with existing rules and regulations that govern TACs through the PCAPCD permitting and monitoring process, this impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation. (DEIR 4.4-33)

Impact 4.4-5 (Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors): The Proposed Project would result in the establishment of sensitive receptors in proximity to existing and future odor sources.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on numerous factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the presence of sensitive receptors. Although offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they still can be unpleasant, leading to considerable distress and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies.

The Proposed Project would result in the establishment of sensitive receptors in proximity to existing and future odor sources, including the PGWWTP, WRSL, Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), industrial land uses, and agricultural uses. PCAPCD Rule 205 provides that air contaminants emitted by any person shall not cause annoyances, and the PCAPCD provides an on-line complaint website and phone number if any resident experiences odor concerns. Also, disclosures will be provided to buyers and occupants of property in the project site (as embodied in the conditions, covenants, and restrictions [CC&Rs]), to ensure that residents and property owners are informed of the proximity of the PGWWTP, WRSL, and agricultural uses and the associated potential for nuisance odors. The proximity of the project site to odor-generating land uses is closer than the buffer distances recommended within the PCAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook; therefore, it is possible that the Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors. This is considered a significant impact. There is no feasible mitigation to reduce this impact while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without exposing sensitive receptors to odor nuisances and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible, this impact is considered to be **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.4-35.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to exposure of sensitive receptors to odors.

Impact 4.4-6 (Consistency with Plans and Policies): Emissions associated with development of the Proposed Project area are not accounted for in the SIP and has the potential to hinder PCAPCD's ability to have the region re-designated as in attainment with regards to the NAAQs and CAAQs.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 Measures to Reduce Short-Term Construction Related Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 Off-Site Mitigation for Operational Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-3.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

Operational emissions associated with development of the Proposed Project would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for criteria pollutants. The Proposed Project is not currently included in the City of Roseville or Placer County General Plans. As a result, the emissions associated with the development of the Proposed Project area are not accounted for in the SIP. Therefore, growth associated with the annexation area has the potential to hinder the PCAPCD's ability to have the region re-designated as in attainment with regards to the NAAQS and CAAQS. This is considered a **significant** impact.

Mitigation measures described in the previous impact discussions would reduce air quality emissions, but not to levels consistent with the current SIP. If the Proposed Project is approved and included in the City's General Plan, it will eventually be included in the SIP when it is next updated so that a revised emissions budget and attainment strategy can be implemented. However, CARB is the lead agency for all purposes with regard to the SIP, and the City would have not have control or authority over the timing or implementation of the amendment of the SIP. With mitigation this impact remains **significant and unavoidable** because amending the SIP is not within the jurisdiction or control of the City. (DEIR p. 4.4-38)

Impact 4.4-7 (Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants): Emissions associated with development of the Proposed Project area are not accounted for in the SIP and has the potential to hinder PCAPCD's ability to have the region re-designated as in attainment with regards to the NAAQs and CAAQs.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 Measures to Reduce Short-Term Construction Related Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 Off-Site Mitigation for Operational Emissions is set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-3.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Past, present, and future development projects contribute to a region's air quality conditions on a cumulative basis. Therefore, by its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to by itself result in non-attainment of the NAAQS or CAAQS.

Implementation of the Proposed Project combined with the proposed developments within the region could lead to cumulative impacts to air quality. Operational activities of the Proposed Project in the year 2034 would result in emissions of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions, which are assumed to be pollutants of concern in the year 2034. The majority of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions would be generated by vehicle trips associated with residents, visitors, and workers at the project site. Consumer products (e.g., cleaning products, aerosol sprays, automotive products) used by residents, visitors, and workers would also contribute ROG and NOx emissions. Lesser sources of precursors would include energy use (fuel combustion for heating and cooling of buildings).

Project-related NOx and ROG emissions would exceed the PCAPCD project specific thresholds of 82 pounds per day. Additionally, as discussed above, the Proposed Project is not consistent with the SIP. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is potentially **significant**. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 cumulative emissions of NOx and ROG would not be reduced to below the PCAPCD thresholds. Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 is recommended below to further reduce project-related emissions.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-2 and 4.4-3, which require a number of measures to reduce vehicular and area source emissions, would reduce the amount of emissions generated by the Proposed Project. The ARSP also includes a variety of policies that would promote the use of alternative forms of transportation and pedestrian access to commercial and office uses within the project site. However, because air emissions associated with the Proposed Project are not accounted for in regional air quality attainment plans, and Proposed Project emissions would still exceed PCAPCD thresholds, development would contribute considerably to the regional degradation of air quality. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. This, because it is impossible to allow for development of the Proposed Project without contributing to cumulative air quality impacts and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible, the Proposed Project's contribution in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **significant and unavoidable** impact to air quality. (DEIR p. 4.4-39.)

3.8.5. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 4.5-1 (Generate a Substantial Contribution to GHG Emissions that Conflicts with an Applicable Plan or Policy): GHG emissions from construction and operation of the Proposed Project would contribute to the cumulative impact of global climate change.

Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 Measures to Reduce GHG Emissions

Implementation of the Air Quality Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 (set forth in full in Section 3.8.4 in relation to Impact 4.4-1 and 4.4-2) would reduce operational and construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, and would also act to reduce GHG emissions associated

with project construction and operation. The requirements of Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 would achieve a 21 percent reduction in GHG emissions over BAU.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Placer County General Plan currently designates the project site as agriculture/timberland. The majority of the project site is undeveloped and has historically been used for agricultural or grazing activities. Because the project site is largely undeveloped, and there currently are no significant GHG-producing agricultural operations other than seasonal cattle grazing, the existing GHG emissions on the project site are conservatively considered zero. The Proposed Project would result in the urbanization of the project site and development of residential, commercial and recreational uses that would generate short-term construction and long-term operational emissions of GHGs. Construction emissions would be associated with vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, vendor trips, and employee compute trips. Operational emissions would be associated with area, mobile, and stationary sources. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as natural gas use for space and water heating, maintenance of landscaping and grounds, waste disposal, and other sources. Mobile-source emissions of GHGs would include project-generated vehicle trips for residents and employees of, and visitors to the project site. In addition, increases in stationary-source emissions could occur by off-site utility providers in order to generate electricity to supply power to the proposed uses within the Plan Area (power produced and/or secured by Roseville Electric). This would result in a contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change and may result in a **potentially significant** impact.

In 2004 SACOG adopted the Preferred Blueprint Scenario for 2050 (Blueprint), which examined how transportation and land use planning could be better linked to accommodate future growth while reducing transportation congestion. In support of this regional effort and to help foster development patterns that incorporate Blueprint smart growth principles, in May 2005, the City adopted implementation strategies to achieve Blueprint project objectives to guide development projects in Roseville. These implementation strategies to give the City a means to implement the "smart growth" principles derived from the Blueprint effort in newly developing areas. To this end, the Proposed Project incorporates smart growth elements, consistent with the Blueprint smart growth principles and the City's Blueprint implementation strategies. In addition to density, other objectives include connectivity of neighborhoods, adjacencies of uses, and opportunities for alternative modes of travel.

The total annual 2020 BAU Project emissions would be approximately 70,434 MT of CO2e per year. As described above, the 2020 BAU Project emissions reflect the basic characteristics of the Proposed Project and do not account for GHG emission reductions that would result from plans, programs and policies implemented as a result of CARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. The 2020 ABAU Project Emissions, which do account for GHG emission reductions that would result from plans,

programs and policies implemented as a result of CARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan, are estimated to be 57,132 MT of CO2 per year, which is 18.9 percent lower than 2020 BAU Project emissions. ABAU emission reductions from the BAU scenario would be accomplished through a combination of energy efficiency measures that have been implemented by the CEC and CARB (California Building Efficiency Standards [2013 Title 24], and Low Carbon Fuel Standards). Since the ABAU Project emissions would not meet the 21 percent less than BAU threshold, this is considered a significant impact. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1, which includes various project design measures consistent with the City's Blueprint implementation strategies, the total annual 2020 ABAU Project Mitigated emissions would be reduced by approximately 5,659 MT of CO2e per year, or an additional 8.1 percent.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1, the Proposed Project's reduction in GHG emissions would exceed the 21 percent reduction over BAU for the year 2020 established within the CARB 2011 reapproved Scoping Plan.

In addition to the GHG reduction goals for 2020 established by AB 32, EO S-3-05 establishes a GHG reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and EO B-30-15 establishes a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 as an intermediate target to meet the ultimate 2050 goals. The CalEEMod model does not account for future programs that may be developed by the state in an effort to meet these targets, so it is not possible to accurately calculate emission estimates for these years. There are several local land use plans that have been adopted in part to reduce GHG emissions within the region; in particular, the Sacramento Region Blueprint, SACOG MTS/SCS, and the City of Roseville Communitywide Action Plan. While the Proposed Project includes many features that meet the objectives of these plans, it was not included in the growth assumptions of these plans, and thus has not been factored in to regional GHG emission estimates and reduction strategies.

Because the Proposed Project has not been factored into regional plans established to the meet the goals of AB 32, including the MTP/SCS, and due to the current disparity between the amount of existing global GHG emissions and the goals of AB 32 and EO S-3-05, even with mitigation measures incorporated, the Proposed Project would contribute a cumulatively considerable, incremental contribution to global GHG emissions and, therefore, would result in a **significant and unavoidable** impact. (DEIR p. 4.5-22)

3.8.6. Noise

Impact 4.6-1 (Short-Term Noise Generated by Construction Activity): Construction activities could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 Construction Noise Reduction

The following measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts of construction noise:

- Ensure construction activities comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance with respect to hours of operation.
- Locate fixed construction equipment such as compressors and generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust ports on power construction equipment.
- Designate a disturbance coordinator and conspicuously post this person's number around the project site and in adjacent public spaces. The disturbance coordinator shall receive all public complaints about construction noise disturbances and shall be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint, and implement any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem.
- Well Drilling Construction Noise:
    - To the extent feasible, the on-site ASR well shall be drilled prior to the occupancy of residential units within 500 feet of the well site.
    - Noise curtains shall be utilized during drilling of the well if, at the time of well construction, homes are occupied within 1,000 feet of the well.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in short-term construction activities associated with individual development projects in the project site. These construction activities could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards and/or result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels. Construction activities would affect residences south and southeast of the project site. In addition, because construction would occur in phases, some on-site residential uses built during the early phases of the development would be exposed to construction activity noise levels during the latter phases of development. Further, future construction of Placer Parkway would likely occur well after after occupancy of residences within the project site.

Activities involved in construction would generate maximum noise levels, as indicated in Table 4.6-9, ranging from 76 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and are anticipated to occur during normal daytime working hours. Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive areas. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and are anticipated to occur during normal daytime working hours. A primary project-generated noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment to and from construction sites. This noise increase would be of short duration, and would occur during daytime hours, pursuant to the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance, as outlined below, with the exception of 24-hour drilling activities for the proposed on-

site Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) well. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that impacts are reduced.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 would reduce potential noise impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project. Construction activities would be temporary in nature, and will comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance. In accordance with the Noise Ordinance, construction activities will occur during normal daytime working hours, with the exception of drilling activities for the proposed ASR well, which will require 24-hour drilling activities. Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 requires that, to the extent feasible, the on-site ASR well shall be drilled prior to the occupancy of residential units within 500 feet of the well site, and noise curtains shall be utilized during drilling of the well if, at the time of well construction, homes are occupied within 1,000 feet of the well. However, because the location of the well may shift in the future due to well testing and water quality requirements, implementation of this measure cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow for the development of the Proposed Project without potentially exposing future residences to noise levels that exceed the City's acceptable noise level standards as a result of 24-hour drilling operations for the ASR well and mitigation of this impact to a less-than significant level would be infeasible, this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.6-20)

Impact 4.6-2 (Commercial Nosie Sources): Commercial uses as part of the Proposed Project could result in off-site noise impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-2 Commercial Noise Controls

For all commercial uses within 500 feet of residential uses, the developer shall implement the following or equally effective measures:

- Where commercial land uses adjoin residential property lines, the following measures shall be included in the design of the commercial use. If the primary noise sources are parking lot noise, HVAC equipment and light truck deliveries, then 6-7 foot tall masonry walls shall be constructed to provide adequate isolation of parking lot and delivery truck activities. HVAC equipment shall be located either at ground level, or when located on roof-tops the building facades shall include parapets for shielding.
- Where commercial uses adjoin common residential property lines, and loading docks or truck circulation routes face the residential areas, the following mitigation measures shall be included in the project design:
    - Loading docks and truck delivery areas shall be a minimum distance of 211 feet from residential property lines;
    - Property line barriers shall be eight feet in height. Circulation routes for trucks shall be located a minimum of 80 feet from residential property lines;
    - Loading dock and truck deliveries shall be limited to daytime hours;

- All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment shall be located within mechanical rooms where possible;
- All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment shall be shielded from view with solid barriers;
- Emergency generators shall comply with the local noise criteria at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers; and
- In cases where loading docks or truck delivery circulation routes are located less than 211 feet from residential property lines or if nighttime deliveries are required, an acoustical evaluation shall be submitted to the City to verify compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards. Uses that do not comply with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards shall not be permitted.
- Prior to City approval of conditionally permitted uses which include more substantial exterior noise sources such as car washes, automotive repair, and outdoor recreation, a noise study shall be prepared by an acoustical engineer that identifies the necessary measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. The City shall require that the measures identified in the noise study are implemented as a condition of approval of conditional use permits.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Within the project site, commercial uses are proposed on the northeastern corner of Westbrook Boulevard and Road "D," as well as on the northwestern corner of Westbrook Boulevard and Road "A." Adjacent to the northern commercial area is a proposed high density residential (HDR) area to the east. The southern commercial area is located adjacent to a proposed medium density residential (MDR) area to the west and HDR area to the north. These commercial areas will be zoned as Community Commercial (CC). The permitted uses under Title 19 (Zoning) of the Roseville Municipal Code primarily include indoor activities, with a few exterior noise sources that could exceed the City's exterior noise level standards at the boundary line of sensitive residential uses. Examples of exterior noise sources include parking lots, mechanical equipment, drive-through speakers.

No specific site designs are proposed for the commercial center at this time; therefore, noise levels cannot be estimated with any specificity and the effectiveness of specific mitigation cannot be determined at this time. However, exterior noise levels from commercial sources may exceed the City's 50 dB Leq daytime and 45 dB Leq nighttime noise level standards at distances of up to 376 feet. The exact degree of noise exposure will depend on the specific use. Because the zoning of the commercial uses would allow for certain uses which could generate significant noise levels,

the potential for off-site adverse noise impacts exists, even though it cannot be completely quantified at this time. This is considered a potentially **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-2 requires measures such as shielding (e.g., berms, masonry walls, landscaping), restriction of delivery hours, and screening of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, to be used to reduce noise levels at residences within 500 feet of commercial uses. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 4.6-2 requires that individual noise studies be prepared for conditionally permitted uses in commercial areas that include more substantial exterior noise sources and measures are implemented as necessary to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, with mitigation, this is considered a **less-than-significant** impact. (DEIR 4.6-22)

Impact 4.6-5 (Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the Existing Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise): Noise levels on Blue Oaks Boulevard west of Fiddyment Road; Pleasant Grove Road, north of Baseline; and Sunset Bouleard West from Pleasant Grove Road to Amoruso Way, are projected to increase by 8.7 dB, 4.3 dB, and 3.5 dB, respectively, due to development of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 Traffic Noise Control

The following measures would reduce impacts to off-site sensitive receptors from traffic noise levels:

- West Sunset Boulevard shall be repaved from Pleasant Grove Road to Westbrook Boulevard using OGAC.
- Pleasant Grove Road shall be repaved north of Baseline Road using OGAC.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The projected noise level increases associated with development of the Proposed Project range from 0.1 to 8.7 dB. Noise levels on Blue Oaks Boulevard west of Fiddyment Road; Pleasant Grove Road, north of Baseline; and West Sunset Boulevard from Pleasant Grove Road to Amoruso Way, are projected to increase by 8.7 dB, 4.3 dB, and 3.5 dB, respectively. These predicted noise level increases would exceed the substantial permanent increase threshold of 3.0 dB. This is a **significant** impact.

A landscaped sound wall/earthen berm combination has already been constructed as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) for the existing residential receptors located along the south side of Blue Oaks Boulevard, west of Fiddyment Road. These noise barriers were based upon projected traffic volumes for cumulative roadway conditions and ensure that exterior and interior traffic noise levels at these sensitive receptors under future conditions do not exceed the City's exterior noise level limits. However, even with these measures, existing receptors would still

experience an 8.7 dB increase in traffic noise levels under Existing Plus Project conditions due to increased traffic volumes on Blue Oaks Boulevard as result of the Proposed Project and this increase cannot be mitigated further. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without impacting residential receptors located along the south side of Blue Oaks Boulevard, west of Fiddyment Road, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is infeasible and this impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Additional Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

Access to existing residential receptors located adjacent to West Sunset Boulevard from Pleasant Grove Road to Amoruso Way and adjacent to Pleasant Grove Road north of Baseline Road, is provided directly from West Sunset Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Road, respectively. Therefore, the use of noise barriers to mitigate traffic noise is not feasible because the access driveway opening would negate any noise reduction that could otherwise be achieved by a sound wall. However, Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would achieve a reduction in noise level increases along West Sunset Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Road north of Baseline Road through use of Open Graded Asphalt Concrete (OGAC) along these sections of the roadways.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would reduce the total increase in traffic noise levels along these roadway segments by a minimum of 3.0 dB, reducing the Proposed Project's noise level increase to approximately 0.5 dB on West Sunset Boulevard and 1.3 on Pleasant Grove Road. Because increases of 0.5 dB and 1.3 dB are less than the established 3.0 dB increase threshold, impacts along these roadway segments would be less than significant after mitigation. However, use of OGAC requires improvements to West Sunset Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Road, which are not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City. Despite the City's own commitment to work with the appropriate agencies, the City would have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-3. Therefore, the City cannot reasonably assume that Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would be implemented by the time that the impact would occur. For these reasons, impacts associated with substantial increases in ambient noise levels along West Sunset Boulevard from Pleasant Grove Road to Amoruso Way and Pleasant Grove Road north of Baseline are considered **significant and unavoidable**. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in the use of OGAC to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under their control. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3, which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR p. 4.6-29)

Impact 4.6-7 (Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 CIP Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site): Noise levels on Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard are projected to increase by 3.3 dB due to development of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.6.3 Traffic Noise Control is set forth in full in Section 3.8.6 in relation to Impact 4.6.5.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*

The projected noise level increases associated with development of the Proposed Project range from 0.1 to 3.3 dB. Noise levels on West Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard are projected to increase by 3.3 dB. This predicted noise level increase would exceed the substantial permanent increase threshold of 3.0 dB. This is a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would reduce impacts on West Sunset Boulevard by reducing the traffic noise level increase to 0.3 dB or less, resulting in a **less-than-significant** impact along this roadway segment. However, use of OGAC requires improvements to West Sunset Boulevard, which are not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City. Despite the City's own commitment to work with the appropriate agencies, the City would have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-3. Therefore, the City cannot reasonably assume that Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would be implemented by the time that the impact would occur. For these reasons, impacts associated with substantial increases in ambient noise levels along West Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard under 2035 CIP Plus Project Conditions are considered **significant and unavoidable**. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in the use of OGAC to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under their control. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3, which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR 4.6-35)

Impact 4.6-9 (Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site): Noise levels on Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard are projected to increase by 3.4 dB due to development of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.6.3 Traffic Noise Control is set forth in full in Section 3.8.6 in relation to Impact 4.6-5.

Finding: *Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public*

agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

The projected noise level increases associated with development of the Proposed Project range from 0.1 to 3.4 dB. Noise levels on West Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard are projected to increase by 3.4 dB. This predicted noise level increase would exceed the substantial permanent increase threshold of 3.0 dB. This is a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would reduce impacts on West Sunset Boulevard by reducing the traffic noise level increase to 0.4 dB or less, resulting in a **less-than-significant** impact along this roadway segment. However, use of OGAC requires improvements to West Sunset Boulevard, which are not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City. Despite the City's own commitment to work with the appropriate agencies, the City would have control or authority over the timing or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-3. Therefore, the City cannot reasonably assume that Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 would be implemented by the time that the impact would occur. For these reasons, impacts associated with substantial increases in ambient noise levels along West Sunset Boulevard from Amoruso Way to Westbrook Boulevard under 2035 CIP Plus Project Conditions are considered **significant and unavoidable**. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2) the City concludes that other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in the use of OGAC to mitigate the impacts occurring in areas under their control. The agencies with jurisdiction over these off-site elements can and should implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3, which would mitigate this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR 4.6-40)

Impact 4.6-10 (Traffic Noise Impacts at Future Noise-Sensitive Land Uses Developed within the Project Site): Residential uses along the future Placer Parkway alignment are predicted to be exposed to interior noise levels of up to 46 dB L_{dn}.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-4 Traffic Noise Attenuation within the Project Site

The following measure shall be implemented to reduce traffic noise impacts:

- A detailed analysis of interior noise levels shall be conducted when building plans are available for the residential uses adjacent to the proposed Placer Parkway alignment. The analysis shall identify noise control measures that are required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard, such as installation of windows and doors with a STC rating of 30 to 35, and these noise control measures shall be implemented to achieve compliance with the City's standard. Such analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant recognized by the City of Roseville.
- Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses adjacent to Placer Parkway to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Noise levels would be above 60 dB along future Placer Parkway in the low density residential (LDR) and MDR areas west of Westbrook Boulevard and the HDR area east of Westbrook Boulevard. However, it is anticipated that noise barriers ranging in height from six to nine feet could be used to reduce exterior noise levels to approximately 61 to 63 dB Ldn at the proposed residential uses located along the future Placer Parkway. The location and final design of noise barriers to address potential impacts from Placer Parkway on future residences within the project site will be determined as part of the environmental review process for the future Placer Parkway project. Although the anticipated noise levels with noise barriers would still exceed the City's 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard, they would comply with the City's conditionally acceptable noise level standard of 75 dB Ldn. Achieving the City's 60 dB Ldn standard will not likely be considered feasible using any other practical noise reduction measures because the City has a sound wall height limit of seven feet, so taller sound walls are prohibited in the City. Noise barrier locations will be determined at the time of the final design of Placer Parkway with consideration of access to open space.

Interior noise levels of residential units could exceed the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. Modern residential construction typically provides an exterior-to-interior noise level reduction of 25 dB. First floor noise exposures at the residential uses along the project roadways are predicted to range between 18 and 43 dB Ldn. Noise levels at second and third floor levels are typically two to three dB louder, or 21 to 46 dB Ldn. The highest noise levels would occur at the residential uses along the future Placer Parkway alignment. These uses are predicted to be exposed to interior noise levels of up to 46 dB Ldn at second or third floor elevations, which exceeds the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. This is considered a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-4 would reduce interior noise impacts by requiring that detailed interior noise analysis be conducted for residential receptors constructed adjacent to the future Placer Parkway alignment and requiring that mechanical ventilation be installed in residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation. As described in Mitigation Measure 4.6-4, the interior noise analysis would detail noise control measures required to achieve compliance with the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard, such as requiring windows and doors on second or third floor residential facades facing Placer Parkway to have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30 to 35. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-4, interior noise levels from traffic within the project site would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.6-41)

3.8.7. Vegetation and Wildlife

Impact 4.8-1 (Loss of Federally Protected Wetlands and "Other Waters" of the United States): Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a loss of 18.640 acres of wetlands.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a) Ensure No Net Loss of Wetlands

The City shall not issue a grading permit for the ARSP unless a CWA Section 404 permit is first obtained from the USACE, or an equivalent approval for waters of the State is obtained from the RWQCB. The CWA Section 404 permit process (including Section 7 Consultation under FESA) is the standard method for developing mitigation for projects that affect wetlands and vernal pool species such as special-status plants, vernal pool crustaceans, and Western spadefoot. Through this process, project applicants shall be required to obtain the necessary permits and approvals to implement their Proposed Project while remaining in compliance with CWA and FESA. If a 404 permit is not obtained, the City shall not issue a grading permit for the Proposed Project. The obligation to obtain the 404 permit shall ensure no net loss to federally protected wetlands. After obtaining such a permit, however, the applicant shall demonstrate to the City's Planning Director that they have also achieved no net loss of wetlands. Mitigation shall consist of a combination of the preservation of on-site vernal pool and other wetland habitat and the acquisition of off-site property with existing vernal pool and other wetland habitat for preservation.

Mitigation shall include off-site creation and/or restoration of vernal pool and other wetland habitat, and/or participation in a mitigation credit program from a wetlands mitigation bank approved by the USACE and USFWS. These banks charge fees in exchange for credits that are based upon the mitigation obligation of the applicant. If the applicant chooses to buy mitigation credits, the applicant shall pay fees that shall be used to restore, create, enhance, and/or preserve wetlands at an established mitigation bank. The credits shall be in direct proportion to the wetland impacts resulting from the Proposed Project.

The project applicants have identified appropriate off-site mitigation in the form of preservation, as shown in DEIR Figure 4.8-3. This off-site mitigation, coupled with on-site preservation and avoidance, shall be a component of the required compensation for the Proposed Project. All wetland restoration and creation shall be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable USACE and USFWS mitigation guidelines and policies.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan

For any wetlands to be restored or created outside of an approved mitigation bank, the Applicant shall submit a Wetland Mitigation Plan to that describes the specific method(s) to be implemented to mitigate for all on-site or off-site project-related impacts. This detailed Wetland Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in accordance with applicable USACE and USFWS policies and regulations, and the City's Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. A copy of the 404 permit, the biological opinion, and the Wetland Mitigation Plan shall be provided to the City at the time of specific entitlements (grading permit, tentative map, etc), and the Wetland Mitigation Plan shall ensure the following to the satisfaction of the City:

a) Describe the location of the proposed wetland mitigation site(s), including a detailed map showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be restored/created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat acreage, values and functions. The compensation wetlands shall

be designed, at a minimum, to meet or exceed the functions of the existing wetlands to be impacted.

b) Include a monitoring plan to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met.

c) Include a long-term maintenance plan for the wetland preservation/mitigation areas describing the measures implemented to assure that they are maintained as wetland habitat in perpetuity.

d) Require that fencing be installed around all existing wetlands that are within 50 feet of any haul route, spoil zone, stockpile zone, creation zone, or other construction area. The fencing shall be of high visibility material. Fencing shall be placed no closer than 10 feet to the delineated, verified perimeter of wetlands. This fencing shall be maintained until all adjacent construction activities are completed.

e) A qualified biological resources monitor, approved by the City, shall be on the site(s) at all times when working in the open space corridor or other sensitive areas to ensure compliance with identified mitigation for the duration of all the proposed activities. The biological resources monitor shall submit bi-annual compliance reports to City monitor for review for a period of five years after completion of construction or until all performance standards have been satisfied.

f) The wetland mitigation site(s) shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist, no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction, for the presence of raptor and federal and state listed bird nesting sites, unless it is determined that construction will occur outside of the breeding season for all species likely to occur on site or observed present. If active nesting sites are observed, all state and federal guidelines pertaining to active nesting sites shall be strictly adhered to in consultation with a qualified biologist.

g) Applicant shall grant full access to the wetland mitigation site(s) to the City for the monitoring of construction activities and mitigation compliance. Access shall be granted during all construction activities and the City monitor may issue stop work orders if mitigation non-compliance is identified.

h) Applicant shall specify measures for reuse or disposal of excavated material that is suitable for use in the project site. The plan should minimize the elapsed time between excavation and reuse and provide adequate stockpile coverage and protection from wind and water erosion during the entire storage period. If excavated material is unsuitable for reuse at the project site, the plan shall include specific information regarding the eventual reuse or disposal site, transportation method(s), disposal reuse management, and schedule.

i) The Wetland Avoidance Mitigation Plan shall include a spill prevention and response plan to the satisfaction of the City.

j) All disturbed areas shall be re-vegetated by the following methods: hydro seeding, drill seeding, or spreading of upland seed bearing soil. The method of re-vegetation shall be approved by a qualified wetland specialist and the City.
k) The applicant shall apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas. Non-toxic binders shall be applied to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydro seeded areas. The wetland mitigation site shall be watered as directed by the City of Roseville Public Works Department. The frequency shall be based on the type of operation, and soil and wind exposure.
l) To reduce air emissions, idling time for all construction vehicles shall be limited to a maximum of 10 minutes. The City may curtail construction during high ambient pollutant concentrations, including but not limited to, ceasing construction during peak-hour vehicular traffic on adjacent or nearby roadways. All land clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 15 mph.
m) The applicants shall ensure that all inactive storage/stock piles are adequately covered, and that all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials also are adequately covered or maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) section 23114.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Implementation of the Proposed Project is anticipated to result in the total loss of an estimated 18.640 acres of wetlands and "other waters" of the U.S. The majority of impacts from the Proposed Project will be to seasonal wetland swales, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools.

Approximately 13.584 acres would be preserved as part of the Proposed Project within areas designated as open space preserve and 1.710 acres of wetlands are avoided by project development; wetlands in other areas are assumed to be filled by development of the Proposed Project. Loss of wetlands would occur as a result of grading in preparation for development, construction of roads and utility corridors, creation of storm water detention basins along stream corridors, and other ground-disturbing activities related to construction. The loss of 18.640 acres of wetlands would have a significant impact to wetlands and waters of the U.S.

Mitigation is proposed to reduce the impacts to waters of the U.S., including vernal pool habitat. The mitigation proposed is typical of minimum requirements of the USACE and USFWS. Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a), discussed in more detail below, requires vernal pool restoration to be completed in accordance with the "no net loss" performance standard, current USACE and USFWS guidelines, and City General Plan policy as set forth in the Wetlands Mitigation Guidelines. Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (b) requires the developer to prepare and submit a Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan for any wetlands to be restored or created outside of an approved mitigation bank.

The overall proposed restoration/creation mitigation would be at a minimum ratio of 1:1 which meets or exceeds the City's standards for no net loss. The goal of the ARSP conservation strategy is to achieve no net loss of wetlands through a combination of onsite avoidance and preservation, offsite acquisition, restoration and preservation of existing vernal pool complexes, and purchase of vernal pool credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank. These wetlands, both onsite and offsite, would be preserved and managed in perpetuity to provide for the long-term viability of the protected wetlands.

The components that make up the wetland mitigation include:

Onsite Avoidance and Preservation

The 15.294 acres of on-site avoidance and preservation includes 1.710 acres wetlands and "other waters" of the U.S. within the ARSP Avoidance Area and 13.584 acres of wetlands and "other waters" of the U.S. within the ARSP Open Space Preserve. The wetlands within the preservation areas that are considered to be occupied by vernal pool fairy shrimp shall be located a minimum of 250 feet from all project development. The onsite preservation areas were identified during early discussions with the USFWS, USACE, and CDFW, and these areas were selected to preserve the highest quality wetland resources present within the project site. The preserved areas will be preserved with a Conservation Easement and resources would be managed according to the City's Preserve Area Overarching Management Plan.

Off-Site Compensatory Mitigation

As detailed in the Preliminary Wetland Mitigation Proposal for the ARSP (ECORP, 2014e), mitigation for impacts to waters of the U.S. is proposed to occur at three off-site mitigation properties. These three properties include Mourier East, Mourier West, and Skover (collectively, "Mitigation Properties;" DEIR Figure 4.8-3). The Mitigation Properties were selected for the following reasons: close proximity to the impact sites (within three miles); identical watershed Hydrologic Unit Code as the project site; appropriate soils characteristics; wetland restoration potential; similar habitat function as the project site; the presence of vernal pool fairy shrimp; and the landscape connectivity and proximity to other regional conservation areas. Additionally, the proposed mitigation is consistent with the draft PCCP regional open space planning goals, which strives to make 50,000 to 60,000 acres within the proposed PCCP plan area part of a reserve system to preserve approximately 50 percent of County's remaining vernal pool habitat.

Because the USACE has a no-net loss policy for wetlands subject to its jurisdiction, satisfaction of the "no net loss" performance standard in Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (a) can be achieved through the 404 permit process. The Section 404 Individual Permit Application has been submitted by the ARSP applicants to the USACE for review. The basic premise of the 404 permit program is that no discharge of material can be permitted into the waters of the U.S. if a practicable alternative exists that is less damaging to the aquatic environment, or if the nation's waters would be significantly degraded. Therefore, applicants for Section 404 permits must show that they have:

- Taken steps to avoid wetland impacts where practicable;
- Minimize potential impacts to wetlands; and
- Provide compensation for any remaining unavoidable impacts through activities to restore or create wetlands.

Under the USACE mitigation policy, restoration of wetland habitats is normally preferred over wetland creation. This approach is consistent with the City/USFWS MOU. The USACE will determine the adequacy of the proposed wetland mitigation, and will require modification of the mitigation plan if it is deemed inadequate. The applicants must obtain a 404 permit prior to discharging any dredged or fill material into any waters of the U.S. Because the 404 permit, in addition to Mitigation Measures 4.8-1(a) and 4.8-1(b), would ensure no net loss of wetlands, impacts would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-46)

Impact 4.8-2 (Loss of Federally Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans and their Habitat): Construction of the Proposed Project would result in direct loss and indirect degradation of habitat for federally listed vernal pool crustaceans.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a) Ensure No Net Loss of Wetlands is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-1

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(b) Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-1

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp Measures

The project applicant shall mitigate the 14.461 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat that will be directly impacted at a 2:1 ratio for preservation (28.922 acres preserved) and 1:1 ratio for creation (14.461 acres created). The 9.972 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp that may be indirectly impacted will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for preservation (9.972 acres). This equates to a total of 38.894 acres of preservation and 18.640 acres of creation. The locations of the preserved and created vernal pool fairy shrimp (Branchinecta lynchi) habitat shall be disclosed in the Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan required in Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (b).

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Suitable habitat for vernal pool crustaceans, such as vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp, is present in the project site. Vernal pool fairy shrimp have been observed within the project site. Loss of wetland habitat would occur as a result of grading and other ground disturbing activities related to the development of the Proposed Project. Approximately 14.461 acres of vernal pools and wetlands that provide habitat for vernal pool crustaceans would be directly impacted by the Proposed Project. Indirect impacts to on-site habitat could impact 8.151 acres, and off-site indirect impacts could impact 1.820 impacts of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat. Potential impacts to avoided vernal pool habitat include possible disturbance resulting from

passive recreation, changes to hydrological conditions, or erosion of adjacent uplands that could result in the deposition of sediment within the wetlands. Additionally, after project construction, vernal pool habitat that is avoided could be subject to further indirect impacts resulting from urban runoff, increased human access (i.e., proximity to development, trails, etc.), vandalism or other human disturbances, and an increase in exotic weed species. Maintenance activities such as fire break maintenance, weed abatement, and construction and maintenance of trails and utilities could also degrade habitat.

Of the 18.640 acres of direct impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. proposed by the ARSP, 14.461 acres are potential habitat for the federally listed vernal pool fairy shrimp (Branchinecta lynchi). An additional 9.9725 acres of potential habitat for the federally listed vernal pool fairy shrimp may also be indirectly impacted during project implementation. Direct loss and indirect degradation of habitat for federally listed vernal pool crustaceans is considered to be a significant impact.

The 14.461 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat that will be directly impacted will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio for preservation (28.922 acres) and 1:1 ratio for creation (14.461 acres). The 9.972 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp that may be indirectly impacted will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for preservation (9.972 acres). This equates to a total of 38.894 acres of preservation and 18.640 acres of creation.

Mitigation is proposed to reduce the impacts to vernal pool habitat. As discussed above, Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 requires vernal pool restoration to be completed in accordance with the "no net loss" performance standard, current USACE and USFWS guidelines, and City General Plan Policy as set forth in the Wetland Mitigation Guidelines. Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 will ensure preservation and creation of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat at 2:1 and 1:1 ratios, respectively. After mitigation these impacts would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-50)

Impact 4.8-3 (Loss of Rare Plant Populations): Impacts to special status plant species could result from grading and other ground disturbing activities related to development of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 Special Status Plant Measures

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to special status plant species:

a) A qualified botanist or biologist shall collect source pool inoculum from the two vernal pools containing dwarf downingia and shall transfer the soil inoculum to the created and/or restored wetlands within the proposed off-site Mitigation Properties. A botanist or qualified biologist shall determine which created pools will provide the best suitable habitat. Created and/or restored wetlands will require monitoring according to Section 404 permit guidelines and therefore transferred inoculum would be covered under such efforts.

b) Perform focused special-status plant surveys according to CDFW, CNPS, and USFWS protocols (CDFW, 2000; CNPS, 2001; Cypher, 2002; USFWS, 1996b) for the three off-site Mitigation Properties. Surveys shall be timed according to the blooming period for target species and known reference populations will be visited prior to surveys to confirm the species is blooming where known to occur.
c) The USFWS generally considers survey results valid for approximately three years. Therefore, follow-up surveys may be necessary within the project site to avoid take of any special status plant species. This shall be determined during consultation with USFWS. The presence or absence of special-status plant species shall be determined through rare plant surveys conducted according to CDFW, CNPS and USFWS protocols (CDFW, 2000; CNPS, 2001; Cypher, 2002; USFWS, 1996b). Surveys shall be timed according to the blooming period for target species and known reference populations will be visited prior to surveys to confirm the species is blooming where known to occur.
d) If no special-status plants are found, no further measures pertaining to special status plants are necessary.
e) If special-status plant species are found within the project site, avoidance zones shall be established around plant populations to clearly demarcate areas for avoidance. Avoidance measures and buffer distances may vary between species and the specific avoidance zone distance will be determined in coordination with appropriate resource agencies (CDFW and USFWS).
f) If special-status plant species are found within the project site and avoidance of the species is not possible, then additional measures such as seed collection and/or transplantation shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies (CDFW and USFWS).

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The project site contains 9.814 acres of vernal pool habitat. Vernal pools represent potential habitat for dwarf dowingia, legenere, Pincushion navarretia, Sacramento Orcutt grass, and other special status plants. Dwarf downingia was observed within two vernal pools within the project site and on the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area. No other special status plants were observed within the project site.

Dwarf dowingia is the only special status plant species known to occur within the impact area, and would be impacted by the Proposed Project. It is not State or federally listed, but is on the CNPS List 2B.2. Although this plant species is relatively common in the project vicinity, removal of these populations would constitute a significant impact due to the cumulative nature of development in the area. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 requires that soil inoculum be collected from the dwarf downingia population and placed at the offsite created and/or restored wetlands to ensure long-term viability of this sensitive plant species.

Impacts to special status plant species could result from grading and other ground disturbing activities related to development of the Proposed Project. Implementation of the ARSP is anticipated to result in the direct loss of vernal pool wetlands. Additionally, some of the remaining vernal pools may be indirectly impacted due to erosion of adjacent uplands, changes in hydrological conditions from grading, or other topographic changes such that precipitation runoff supplies are interrupted and prevent the pools from filling properly. Loss of special status plants would be considered a **significant** impact.

Compliance with FESA would reduce impacts associated with the loss of federally listed vernal pool crustaceans and their habitat and the loss and degradation of rare plant populations by requiring any project that would result in the take of any federally listed threatened or endangered species to obtain authorization from the USFWS. Protection, preservation, and replacement of habitat for special status plants can be achieved through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-1, which ensure no net loss of wetlands. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 would require additional special status plant surveys for the off-site improvement areas that may contain listed plant species, and provides protective measures should any special status plants be identified. After implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8-1 and 4.8-3 this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-51)

Impact 4.8-4 (Loss of Degradation of Habitat for Western Spadefoot): Loss of potential habitat for the Western spadefoot may result due to grading or other ground disturbance related to development of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 Relocate Western Spadefoot

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to Western spadefoot (Spea hammondii):

a) A qualified biologist shall perform preconstruction surveys for Western spadefoot within the construction area in the appropriate season (generally February) to detect adults, larvae, and/or egg masses, within 14 days prior to the start of construction.
b) If no Western spadefoots are found, no further measures pertaining to this species are necessary.
c) Pools that are found to support Western spadefoot shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, then the CDFW shall be consulted for its recommendation with respect to relocation of adults, larvae, tadpoles, or egg masses. Although there is no set protocol for the relocation of Western spadefoot, the capture and relocation of reptile and amphibian species from habitat that will be impacted to similar areas of protected suitable habitat is a standard part of both USFWS and CDFW procedures and recommendations for mitigating impacts. When done in combination with habitat restoration and preservation, the procedure is known to be successful in reducing potential impacts to special-status amphibian and reptile populations.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Within the project site, potential habitat for the western spadefoot includes vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, and adjacent grassland habitat. Impacts on this species would occur as a result of the loss of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, and grassland habitat due to grading or other ground disturbance related to development of the Proposed Project. This species is a State species of concern.

Western spadefoots have been detected in the past in the vicinity of the project site. Development on vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, and the adjacent habitat could result in the destruction of individual Western spadefoot and/or its habitat. This would be a **significant** impact.

Prior to grading or other earth moving activities, Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 would be implemented to capture any adult or larval western spadefoots or western spadefoot egg masses, and relocate them to suitable habitat. This mitigation measure would greatly enhance the survival rates of western spadefoots that are displaced during construction by relocating them to protected areas of suitable habitat. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8-1(a) and 4.8-1(b), which require preservation and protection of existing vernal pools, would protect individual western spadefoots by avoiding impacts on areas that are designated open space. Ensuring no net loss of wetlands would provide protection of potential habitat for western spadefoot by preserving or enhancing and protecting habitat that is capable of supporting this species. After implementation of mitigation this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR p. 4.8-52)

Impact 4.8-5 (Loss of Degradation of Habitat for Northwestern Pond Turtle): Construction of the Proposed Project may impact northwestern pond turtles if they are located within an area designated for development.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 Relocate Northwestern Pond Turtle

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to northwestern pond turtle (Actinemys armorata):

a) A qualified biologist shall perform preconstruction surveys for northwestern pond turtle within the construction area for each phase of the Proposed Project within 24 hours prior to the start of construction.
b) If no northwestern pond turtles are found, no further measures pertaining to this species are necessary.
c) If northwestern pond turtles are found within an area proposed for impact, a qualified biologist shall relocate the northwestern pond turtle to a suitable location away from the proposed construction, in consultation with CDFW.

Findings: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

No northwestern pond turtles were found during surveys, and University Creek and the wetlands are considered marginal habitat for this species. The Proposed Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on western pond turtles through habitat modification because University Creek will remain as open space as part of the ARSP. After development, no long-term impacts to northwestern pond turtle will occur. However, construction may impact any turtles if they are located within an area designated for development, and the impact from the Proposed Project is assumed to be **significant**. To prevent turtle mortality, Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 ensures that any turtles present in the development footprint are relocated to a protected area of suitable habitat outside the area of disturbance. Therefore, after mitigation, impacts from the Proposed Project are **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-53)

Impact 4.8-6 (Disruption of Swainson's Hawk, Burrowing Owl, and Other Legally Protected Raptors' Nesting and Foraging Habitat): Project implementation would result in the loss and degradation of habitat for Swainson's Hawk, Burrowing Owl, and other legally protected raptors.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 Avoid Nesting Sites for Protected Bird Species

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

a) **Nesting Raptors:** All raptors and their active nests are protected under the California Fish and Game Code and federal MBTA. To ensure that there are no impacts to protected active nests, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
    - A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction of the project site and all accessible areas within 300 feet of the limits of construction activity. The preconstruction surveys shall occur within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31).
    - If no active raptor nests are found, no further measures pertaining to raptors nests are necessary.
    - If active nests are found, the active nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist for the first 24 hours prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in accordance with CDFW's recommendations for buffer distances relative to the species identified.
    - Once construction activities commence within the project site, all nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures.

- Pre-construction nest surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season.

b) **Burrowing Owl:** Burrowing owls were detected within the project site during surveys. To minimize impacts to protected burrowing owls and their burrows, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
    - If possible, initiate construction activities during the non-breeding season, September 1 through January 31.
    - A qualified biologist shall conduct a take avoidance (pre-construction) burrowing owl survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction of the project site and all accessible areas within 150 meters (492 feet) of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity, according to the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012). If no burrowing owls or sign are observed, construction may proceed.
    - If burrowing owls or sign are found, avoidance setbacks shall be implemented in accordance with CDFW Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012).
    - If avoidance setbacks are infeasible, the qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW to conduct passive relocation according to protocol outlined in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012). If passive relocation methods are employed, the project impact site shall be rendered inhospitable for further burrowing owl reoccupation.

c) **Swainson's Hawk:** Swainson's hawks have been found nesting on the adjacent CSP Area to the south of the project site (City of Roseville, 2011a). To minimize impacts to protected Swainson's hawks and their nests, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
    - If possible, initiate site construction activities during the non-breeding season, September 1 through February 28.
    - A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction of the project site and all accessible areas within 0.5 mile of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (March 1 through August 31).
    - If no active Swainson's hawk nests are found, no further measures pertaining to Swainson's hawk nests are necessary.
    - If active nests are found, the qualified biologist shall monitor the active nests for the first 24 hours prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in accordance with CDFW's recommendations.

- Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction within the project site. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures.
- Pre-construction Swainson's hawk nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season.

d) **California Black Rail:** There is no potential California black rail habitat with the project site. However, surveys or habitat assessments for this species have not been performed within the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area. To ensure that there are no impacts to California black rail, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
- A qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment of the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area to identify suitable California black rail habitat. The qualified biologist shall prepare a map identifying areas that support suitable habitat.
- If suitable habitat is within areas proposed for construction during the breeding season (February 1 through July 31), the qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for the California black rail. Three surveys shall be conducted at least seven days apart during peak calling times (one half hour before dawn until three hours after, and three hours before sunset until one half hour after) using playback of taped breeding calls. The last survey shall occur within 14 days of the start of construction.
- If no California black rail is detected, no further measures pertaining to this species are necessary.
- If a California black rail is detected, impacts shall be avoided by establishing an appropriate buffer, as determined by the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the rail has evacuated the area. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist and confirmed by CDFW; buffer size may vary, depending on the nest location, nest stage, and construction activity.

e) **Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo:** There is no Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat with the project site. However, surveys or habitat assessments have not been performed within the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area. To ensure that there are no impacts to Western yellow-billed cuckoo, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
- A qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment of the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area and the three off-site Mitigation Properties to

identify suitable Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat. The qualified biologist shall prepare a map identifying areas that support suitable habitat.

- If suitable habitat is proposed for construction during the breeding season (June 15 to August 31), prior to construction, the qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for Western yellow-billed cuckoo.
- The survey shall include three visits at least 10 days apart. Each survey shall be conducted during peak activity times (6:30 a.m.to 12:00 noon) by using playback of taped "kowlp" calls. Five taped calls (each at least 30 seconds apart) shall be played every 100 meters of linear habitat.
- If a Western yellow-billed cuckoo is detected, impacts shall be avoided by establishing an appropriate buffer, as determined by the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the cuckoo has evacuated the area. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist and confirmed by CDFW; buffer size may vary, depending on the nest location, nest stage, and construction activity.
- If no Western yellow-billed cuckoos are detected, no further measures pertaining to Western yellow-billed cuckoos are necessary.

f) **Nuttall's Woodpecker, Loggerhead Shrike, Yellow-billed Magpie, Oak Titmouse, and Grasshopper Sparrow:** The project site support potential nesting habitat for one special-status woodpecker and five special status passerine bird species: Nuttall's woodpecker (USFWS conservation concern), loggerhead shrike (USFWS conservation concern and CDFW SSC), yellow-billed magpie (USFWS conservation concern), oak titmouse (USFWS conservation concern), and grasshopper sparrow (CDFW SSC). To ensure that there are no impacts to protected active nests of these species, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction within the project site and all accessible areas within 50 feet of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (Nuttall's woodpecker, March-July; loggerhead shrike, March-May; yellow-billed magpie, late February-mid-July; oak titmouse, March-July; grasshopper sparrow, May-July).
- If no active special-status bird nests are found, no further measures pertaining to special-status birds are necessary.
- If active nests are found, the active nests will be monitored by a qualified biologist prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW.
- Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction of

the Proposed Project. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures.

- Pre-construction bird nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season.

g) **Migratory Bird Treaty Act Birds:** Many birds, including commonly occurring species, are protected under the California Fish and Game Code and the Federal MBTA. To ensure that there are no impacts to protected birds or their active nests, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction within the project site and all accessible areas within 50 feet of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31).
- If no protected birds are found, no further measures pertaining to protected birds are necessary.
- If active nests are found, a qualified biologist shall monitor the active nests prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW.
- Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests will be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction of the Proposed Project. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures.
- Pre-construction bird nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat

CDFW recommends that projects that result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk (which includes grasslands) within 10-miles of an active nest site provide mitigation for that loss. To the extent feasible, strategies for preserving on-site grasslands as raptor and migratory bird foraging habitat shall be addressed in the Operations and Maintenance Plan prepared pursuant to the Section 404 Permit. Some of these strategies could include; but are not necessarily limited to, grazing for grassland management, monitoring for biological values, and adaptive management. Mitigation for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would concurrently mitigate for loss of habitat

for a number of other bird species in the region such as burrowing owl, red-tailed hawk, whitetailed kite, northern harrier, Ferruginous hawk, and loggerhead shrike among others.

A Swainson's Hawk Grassland Habitat Mitigation Plan shall be developed to mitigate for the loss of foraging habitat. Therefore, the project applicant shall preserve no less than 595.7 acres of grassland and agricultural foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. Approximately 91.4 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be maintained and preserved onsite. The remainder of the mitigation shall be accomplished via the preservation of 499.9 acres of grassland communities within the three off-site Mitigation Properties, which will offset the loss of foraging habitat pursuant to the CDFW-established formula for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat replacement.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Grassland and trees within the project site provide suitable foraging habitat and nesting sites for legally protected bird and raptor species including: Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, Cooper's hawk, whitetailed kite, northern harrier, and ferruginous hawk, among others. Special status species surveys in the project site documented the presence of several legally protected bird and raptor species. As discussed above, the following special status or protected bird species were observed foraging on the project site or within the project site during surveys: tricolored blackbird, oak titmouse, Swainson's hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, yellow-billed magpie, Nuttall's woodpecker, and ferruginous hawk. Only the burrowing owl was observed nesting within the project site. The State-listed threatened Swainson's hawk is known to nest in the CSP Area immediately south of the project site (City of Roseville, 2011a) and in the Placer Ranch area to the east of the project site (ECORP, 2015b).

Construction disturbance as part of project development could result in active nest abandonment, removal of an active nest, or other injury to a protected bird or raptor species. This is considered a **significant** impact. Compliance with the MBTA and CESA would reduce impacts by prohibiting the take of any migratory bird listed, including nests, eggs or products, or the removal of any pertinent shrub or tree that could affect nesting. To ensure that legally protected birds of prey are not taken during project construction, Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 requires that, when feasible, tree removals or excavations near potential burrowing owl burrows occur during the period when these species are not nesting (September through February). In addition, other protected birds and raptors are protected from take through completion of pre-construction surveys and avoidance buffers, if necessary. After mitigation, impacts to protected birds and raptors due to construction of the Proposed Project are **less than significant**.

Compliance with the MBTA and CESA (for Swainson's Hawks), as well as implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-6, would reduce impacts on the nesting by preventing disturbance that would cause nest abandonment and subsequent loss of their young. Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 requires a total of 591.3 acres of suitable grassland habitat are permanently preserved both onsite

and offsite that would also reduce impacts to foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and other protected bird species. After implementation of these mitigation measures, this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-54)

Impact 4.8-7 (Loss of Grassland Habitat): Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of an estimated 407 acres of grassland and agricultural foraging habitat through grading and conversion to various urban uses.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Non-native annual grassland is the dominant vegetation community throughout the project site.

Grassland is important for foraging for special status and other legal protected raptors, including the State threatened Swainson's hawk and a wider variety of other wildlife species such as burrowing owls and long-billed curlew. CDFW considers the loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk within 10 miles of an active Swainson's hawk nest site to be detrimental to the breeding success of this species.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of an estimated 407 acres of grassland and agricultural foraging habitat through grading and conversion to various urban uses. This represents approximately 76.4 percent of the grasslands in the 694.4-acre project site. Due to the potential negative effects that loss of foraging habitat could have on wildlife species, this is a **significant** impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 would reduce the impacts from loss of grassland to a **less-than-significant** level by protecting 591.3 acres of similar habitat in southwestern Placer County in perpetuity (499.9 acres will be off-site), according to a CDFW-established mitigation formula for loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, and by ensuring that 91.4 acres of on-site preserved grasslands are managed as raptor and migratory bird foraging habitat. Protection of on- and off-site grasslands will reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.8-55)

Impact 4.8-8 (Substantial Interference with the Movement of Resident Migratory Wildlife Species): Development of the project site could impede the movement of wildlife by disturbing and/or blocking local movement corridors. Outdoor lighting may interfere with nocturnal movement. Passive recreational use may interfere with foraging, breeding, or movement.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies

To protect the long term habitat of the University Creek stream channel and associated riparian corridor as for use as wildlife movement and migration corridors, the project applicants shall ensure that movement corridors are not obstructed. Through compliance with Section 1600 of the

CDFW Code, the applicant(s) shall enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to conducting any construction activities within the stream corridor, which sets forth mitigation measures that the applicant must implement. These measures shall include, but not be limited to, the use of a bridge and/or culvert for the road crossing that is large enough that wildlife have enough space to pass without having to travel over the road surface, the implementation of bank stabilization measures, and/or restoration and revegetation of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged due to the project's construction. The road crossing feature shall be constructed in a configuration as to provide wildlife with unimpeded passage. Furthermore, recreational use trails shall be lined by post and rail fence and signage shall be posted to direct trail users to stay within the designated trail corridor. The trails shall be closed to use one-half hour after sunset to one-half hour before sunrise and shall not be illuminated.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spill Over into University Creek and Open Space Areas is set forth in full in Section 3.8.14 in relation to Impact 4.14-2.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development of the project site could impede the movement of wildlife by disturbing and/or blocking local movement corridors. Additionally, many of those species that would normally use the grasslands as a foraging area would not as easily move across the future urbanized landscapes proposed for development. With development of the Proposed Project, wildlife would be naturally restricted to the remaining areas of designated open space such as the University Creek open space area. Thus, this will become the primary wildlife corridor through the urbanized landscape.

Construction of stream crossings and other activities, as well as the introduction of artificial light, would alter the corridors and disturb the wildlife using them. The potential loss of local travel routes and the potential future restriction of movement through the site due to obstructions to the stream/riparian open space corridor are discussed below.

Wildlife species that are adapted to live in grasslands or that move between isolated pockets of water would not easily move across the future urbanized landscapes, would be displaced, and may concentrate their movements within the remaining open space. The ARSP provides for an open space corridor along University Creek which would allow relatively free access through the site. However, the construction of a road crossing for Westbrook Boulevard could create a barrier that would prevent wildlife passage along this corridor.

Erosion and runoff during construction of project facilities would be controlled by BMPs as required by the City's Improvement Standards and NPDES General Permit. Nonetheless, alterations to the flow, bed, channel, or bank of University Creek within the project site as a result of project improvements would affect the ability of the corridor to provide habitat for the wildlife species that depend upon it for feeding, cover, and nesting, and thus could result in a loss of that habitat.

Outdoor lighting can also have a negative effect on wildlife by interfering with nocturnal movement and causing disorientation, making individuals more vulnerable to predation or making it more difficult for them to capture prey. Passive recreational use along nature or bicycle trails may also have indirect impacts such as interfering with foraging, breeding, or movement. These impacts are **significant**.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 requires the use of either a bridge or culvert that is large enough that wildlife has enough space to pass through the road crossing without having to travel over the road surface. Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 requires that outdoor lighting be placed, designed, and directed to avoid spillover light into the University Creek and open space preserve areas. After implementation of these mitigation measures, this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-56)

Impact 4.8-10 (Loss of Riparian Habitat): Deterioration of the creek channel could result from construction activities, intrusion of artificial lighting, non-native invasive plant species, domestic animals, or human activity in or along the creek channel.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-8**.**

Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spill Over into University Creek and Open Space Areas is set forth in full in Section 3.8.14 in relation to Impact 4.14-2.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in development that would occur in proximity to the riparian habitat and stream corridor along University Creek. The extension of Westbrook Boulevard may include a culvert or bridge crossing that would impact University Creek and its riparian habitat.

Deterioration of the creek channel could result from construction activities, intrusion of artificial lighting, non-native invasive plant species, domestic animals, or human activity (i.e., jogging, walking, and biking) in or along the creek channel. Trampling of stream banks could occur when people descend or climb the banks, which would remove vegetation directly or indirectly by causing soil compaction or erosion. Increased human recreational and residential uses could result in an increase in domestic animals, which could impact native wildlife by reducing habitat and by increasing wildlife mortality. These impacts could also occur during construction of the Proposed Project. This impact is **significant**.

Implementation of Sections 1600-1607 of the Fish and Game Code would reduce impacts associated with the blocking or degradation of stream corridors by regulating activities that would alter the flow, bed, channel, or bank of streams. Implementation of Chapter 9.80 of the Municipal Code (Flood Damage Protection) would control the alteration of natural floodplains stream

channels, and natural protective barriers, which help accommodate or channel flood waters. In addition, the City's Improvement Standards and Floodplain Development Regulations would control fill, grading, dredging, and other development, which may increase flood damage. The Proposed Project would be required to obtain a USACE 404 permit and adhere to any permit requirements included therein. Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 and Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level along University Creek by installing fences and signage to keep trail users within designated trail corridors and limiting lighting within the riparian area. After mitigation, impacts to riparian habitat would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-59)

Impact 4.8-11 (Potential Impact to Bats): Development of the Proposed Project may impact the foraging and roosting habitats of special status bat species.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 Pre-Construction Surveys for Special Status Bats

To ensure that there are no impacts to active bat roosts, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

a) A qualified biologist shall conduct a dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last three hours), followed by a pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for two hours), in addition a daytime visual inspection of all potential bat roosting habitat within the limits of construction within the project site included as part of the pre-construction clearance survey. If no active bat roosts or sign are observed, construction may proceed.
b) If no active special-species bat roosts are found, no further measures pertaining to special-species bats are necessary.
c) If roosting special-species bats are found on-site during the surveys, avoid direct and indirect impacts to roosting sites by establishing a no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet around roost sites, in consultation with CDFW.
d) Clearing and grubbing adjacent to the roost site and lighting use near the roost site where it would shine on the roost or interfere with bats entering or leaving the roost shall be prohibited.
e) Operation of internal combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps, and vehicles within 100 feet of the roost site shall be prohibited.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Two special status bats potentially occur in the project site: pallid bat and Townsend's big-eared bat, which are both State SSCs. The project site may support suitable foraging habitat, and the dilapidated barn/residences and several trees may support roosting or maternity sites. Development impacts to the foraging and roosting habitats of these special status bat species would be **significant**.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 to protect grassland habitat will mitigate potential impacts to bat foraging habitat to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 ensures that a qualified biologist conduct preconstruction surveys at dusk and dawn for potential bat roosting habitat and provides avoidance measures should any special status bats be identified. With implementation of mitigation, this impact would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-60)

Impact 4.8-12 (Potential Impact to American Badger): Construction of the Proposed Project may impact badgers should they occur within the area designated for development.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 Pre-Construction Surveys for American Badger

The annual grasslands within the project site have a low potential to support habitat for American badger. To ensure that there are no impacts to American badgers and their burrows, the following mitigation measures are required:

a) In conjunction with pre-construction burrowing owl surveys (Mitigation Measure 4.8-6), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for American badgers, including burrows. If no American badgers or signs are observed, construction may proceed.
b) If no American badgers/active burrows are found, no further measures pertaining to this species are necessary.
c) If American badgers are found on-site during the surveys, the qualified biologist shall avoid direct and indirect impacts to burrows by establishing a no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet around burrows, in consultation with CDFW.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Although no American badgers were identified during biological surveys, the annual grasslands within the project site provides marginal habitat to support the American badger (ECORP, 2015c; Appendix P). Any impacts from construction or operation of the Proposed Project to this State species of concern would be **significant**.

Construction may impact any badgers should they occur within an area designated for development. To prevent badger mortality, Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 ensures that any badger burrows present in the development footprint are avoided in consultation with CDFW. Long-term impacts to American badger habitat would occur from conversion of grasslands to urban uses. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 for off-site and on-site preservation of grassland, impacts to badger habitat are reduced to **less-than-significant** levels. Therefore, after mitigation, impacts from the Proposed Project would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-61)

Impact 4.8-15 (Loss of Biological Resources Due to Construction of Off-Site Infrastructure): Development of infrastructure improvements outside of the project site may result in direct and indirect impacts to biological resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a) and (b) is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 Special Status Plant Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-3.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 Relocate Western Spadefoot is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-4.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 Relocate Northwestern Pond Turtle is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-5.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 Avoid Nesting Sites for Protected Bird Species is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-8.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 Pre-Construction Surveys for Special Status Bats is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-11.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 Pre-Construction Surveys for American Badger is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-12.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-11 Additional Surveys for Off-Site Improvement Areas

Prior to construction of any off-site infrastructure, a qualified biologist shall perform detailed, and if necessary, focused biological surveys of any undisturbed areas that would be affected by infrastructure development. If it is determined that wetland resources or sensitive species would be impacted, Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (a) and (b), Mitigation Measure 4.8-2, or Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 shall be implemented, as appropriate to the resource. If it is determined that impacts to western spadefoot or northwestern pond turtle may occur due to off-site constructions, Mitigation Measures 4.8-4 and 4.8-5 shall be implemented, respectively. If it is determined that active nests exist within the off-site improvement location, Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 shall be implemented as appropriate to the species. If it is determined the offsite improvement is located within or adjacent to a wildlife movement corridor, Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 shall be

implemented. If any bat roosts are identified, Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 shall be implemented. If any badger burrows are located, Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 shall be implemented.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development of the Proposed Project would require infrastructure improvements outside of the project site, such as extension of roadways; extension of water, wastewater, and recycled water infrastructure; and the extension of electric and natural gas lines. Potential impacts from these activities include both direct and indirect impacts to:

- Special status species, including State and federally threatened endangered species;
- Wetland and vernal pool habitat;
- Oak trees; and
- Stream and Riparian Habitat.

No formal focused surveys or wetland delineation have been performed within the offsite infrastructure areas (with the exception of the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvement area) as part of the BRA. Most offsite improvements would be constructed within street ROWs. Because infrastructure for the Proposed Project would be located in road ROWs or undeveloped land similar to the project site, the biological resources that would be expected to occur would not differ substantially from those identified in this EIR. Nonetheless, offsite improvements would result in **potentially significant** impacts to biological resources. Mitigation Measure 4.8-11 requires that surveys be conducted by qualified biologists prior to construction of the offsite infrastructure facilities. The purpose of these surveys will be to determine the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources in the areas that would be disturbed. If such resources are discovered, then appropriate mitigation measures as described in this EIR shall be implemented in the offsite infrastructure areas as explained in Mitigation Measure 4.8-11. These measures will ensure that impacts on special status species or their habitat that occur within the offsite infrastructure areas would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.8-63)

Impact 4.8-16 (Loss of Biological Resources Due to Development of Urban Reserve Parcel): Development of the Urban Reserve parcel may result in direct and indirect impacts to biological resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a) and (b) is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 Special Status Plant Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-3.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 Relocate Western Spadefoot is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-4.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 Relocate Northwestern Pond Turtle is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-5.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 Avoid Nesting Sites for Protected Bird Species is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-8.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 Pre-Construction Surveys for Special Status Bats is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-11.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 Pre-Construction Surveys for American Badger is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-12.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-12 Conduct Biological Surveys of Urban Reserve Parcel

Prior to construction activities within the Urban Reserve parcel, a qualified biologist shall perform detailed, and if necessary, focused biological surveys of any undisturbed areas that would be affected by development. If it is determined that wetland resources or sensitive species would be impacted, Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (a) and (b), Mitigation Measure 4.8-2, or Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 shall be implemented, as appropriate to the resource. If it is determined that impacts to western spadefoot or northwestern pond turtle may occur, Mitigation Measures 4.8-4 and 4.8-5 shall be implemented, respectively. If it is determined that active nests exist, Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 shall be implemented as appropriate to the species. If development is proposed within or adjacent to a wildlife movement corridor, Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 shall be implemented. If any bat roosts are identified, Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 shall be implemented. If any badger burrows are located, Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 shall be implemented.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development of the Urban Reserve parcel with a single residential unit could result in both direct and indirect impacts to:

- Special status species, including State and federally threatened endangered species;
- Wetland and vernal pool habitat;
- Oak trees; and
- Stream and Riparian Habitat.

No formal focused surveys or wetland delineations have been performed within the Urban Reserve parcel as part of the BRA. However, University Creek flows through the southern portion of the parcel and habitat types are expected to be substantially similar to those found within the project site. Therefore, construction activities within the Urban Reserve parcel would result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-12 requires that surveys be conducted by qualified biologists prior to construction within the Urban Reserve parcel. The purpose of these surveys will be to determine the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources. If such resources are discovered, then appropriate mitigation measures as described in this EIR shall be implemented as explained in Mitigation Measure 4.8-12. These measures will ensure that impacts on special status species or their habitat that occur within the Urban Reserve parcel would be less than significant.

Impact 4.8-18 (Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources): Full build out of the ASRP would significantly contribute to the urbanization of western Placer County.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-1(a) and (b) is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 Special Status Plant Measures is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-3.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 Relocate Western Spadefoot is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-4.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 Relocate Northwestern Pond Turtle is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-5.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 Avoid Nesting Sites for Protected Bird Species is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 Off-Site and On-Site Preservation of Grassland Habitat is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-6.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-8 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-8.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-9 Pre-Construction Surveys for Special Status Bats is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-11.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 Pre-Construction Surveys for American Badger is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-12.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-11 Additional Surveys for Off-Site Improvement Areas is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-15.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-12 Conduct Biological Surveys of Urban Reserve Parcel is set forth in full in Section 3.8.7 in relation to Impact 4.8-16.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The cumulative context for the evaluation of impacts on biological resources is regional development, particularly western Placer County, which contains habitat very similar to the project site.

Over the past few decades, tens of thousands of acres of grasslands have been developed or designated for development in western Placer County. Development has occurred in and around the cities of Roseville, Lincoln, and Rocklin. Development has also occurred further north in the grasslands of Sacramento County. Future development would result in the further decline of native plant communities, including vernal pool habitat. The proximity of urban development also would contribute to the distribution of non-native plant and wildlife species, which would further degrade the habitat and available niches for native species in the surrounding region. This impact is **significant and cumulative**.

The full build out of the ARSP would significantly contribute to the urbanization of western Placer County.

Vernal Pool Wetlands/Rare Plants

The Proposed Project would result in the loss of approximately 558.7 acres of grasslands that contain scattered vernal pools. Implementation of the ARSP is anticipated to result in the loss of approximately 18.640 acres of wetlands and waters of the U.S. Within the project site, the Placer Parkway regional transportation project would convert an additional 4.562 acres of wetlands, resulting in a cumulative loss of wetlands within the project site of 23.202 acres. Other development that would convert vernal pool grasslands to urban development includes Placer Vineyards, Regional University, Creekview, Brookfield, and Curry Creek. Cumulative loss of vernal pools is a **significant** impact. The Proposed Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable.

Raptor Species

Based on information from other environmental documents and the CNDDB, potential habitat forSwainson's hawk, burrowing owl, and other species are widely distributed within Placer and adjacent counties. Other projects in the vicinity will convert grassland and cropland, both of which provide foraging habitat. This impact is **significant and cumulative**. The ARSP would result in

the permanent loss of habitat for these species, which are present within the development boundaries. This is a cumulatively considerable contribution to the **significant** impact.

Mitigation measures identified reduce the severity of significant project related impacts to a **less-than-significant** level. However, even with these mitigation measures, a substantial change in habitat conditions would result as a consequence of cumulative development in the region, transitioning from a rural to an urban environment. The amount of undeveloped habitat available for wildlife use will decrease as development occurs and as the amount of habitat decreases, wildlife species that are incompatible with urban development will be displaced.

Cumulative development within the region would result in the loss of grasslands, wetlands, and vernal pool habitat. The loss of this habitat would also result in impacts to special status plant and animal species. Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow for development of the Proposed Project without incremental contribution to the impact on loss of grasslands, wetlands and vernal pool habitat and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, the regional impacts would be considered **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.8-63.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to the impact on loss of grasslands, wetlands, and vernal pool habitat.

3.8.8. Cultural Resources

Impact 4.9-1 (Cause an Adverse Change to Historical or Archaeological Resources): Development of the Urban Reserve parcel with a single residential unit consistent with allowable uses under the proposed general plan designation could impact historic or archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 Conduct Archaeological Survey of UR Parcel

Development proposals for the Urban Reserve parcel shall identify known and/or potential archaeological sites, based on field surveys of the area proposed for development conducted by a qualified archaeologist. If significant resources or significant archaeological sites are present, the development proposal shall designate the area surrounding the site as open space and the site shall be completely avoided.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Urban Reserve Parcel

There are no known structures or previously recorded historic or archaeological resources within the 20-acre Urban Reserve parcel; however, this area has not been subject to a cultural resources survey because no development is proposed at this time. Development of the Urban Reserve parcel

with a single residential unit consistent with allowable uses under the proposed general plan designation could impact historic or archaeological resources. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact. Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 requires that appropriate studies be conducted prior to issuance of building permits for construction within the Urban Reserve parcel, and that if any prehistoric or historical resources are found, that they be evaluated for significance and avoided, preserved, or recorded as appropriate. This mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.9-15)

Impact 4.9-2 (Disturb, Damage, or Destroy Unidentified Subsurface Archaeological or Historical Resources or Human Remains during Project Construction): Buried prehistoric resources or human remains could be encountered during ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2(a) Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist

Should any cultural resources, such as wells, foundations, or debris, or unusual amounts of bone, stone or shell, artifacts, burned or baked soils, charcoal, or human remains be encountered during subsurface excavation or construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the discovery. The City shall be immediately notified. At that time, a qualified professional archaeologist shall assess the resource and provide recommendations for treatment if the resource appears to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Possible management recommendations could include, but not be limited to, avoidance, construction monitoring, recordation, site testing, or data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City staff, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources prior to resumption of ground-disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2(b) Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist

If human remains are uncovered during project construction, pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98 and Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, the Placer County Coroner shall be notified immediately. California law recognizes the need to protect interred human remains, particularly Native American burials and items of cultural patrimony, from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of discovered human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and California PRC §5097. If human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all such activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall be halted immediately and the City's designated representative shall be notified. The City shall immediately notify the Placer County coroner. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]). The City shall contact the Most Likely Descendent (MLD), as determined by the NAHC, regarding the remains.

The MLD, in cooperation with the City and a qualified professional archaeologist shall develop a plan of action to avoid or minimize significant effects to the human remains prior to resumption of ground-disturbing activities.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The only cultural resource identified within the project site is an isolated mano, a prehistoric hand-held grinding tool found during site surveys conducted in 2000. This artifact could not be located during cultural resource surveys of the project site performed in 2008, however (ECORP, 2008b). Historic use of part of the project site as a ranch indicates that there is potential for buried historical resources as well; historical archaeological deposits uncovered during construction would not necessarily be associated with the ranch and would need to be evaluated for their connection to previous use of the project site as a ranch.

The presence of a water source, University Creek, along the southern portion of the Proposed Project, and the previously located mano indicate some sensitivity for prehistoric resources. Buried prehistoric resources or human remains could be encountered during grading, excavation, and or construction as well. If such resources are encountered during construction either on-site or within the off-site improvements areas, they could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of integrity or other criteria that could make them eligible to the CRHR or the NRHP. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

If evidence of historic or prehistoric artifacts or sites or human remains is uncovered during project development, Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 requires that all work cease within 100 feet of the find so that artifacts or remains are not further damaged by equipment. Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 reduces impacts to unknown cultural resources that qualify as historical resources, unique archaeological resources, historic properties, or human remains by requiring avoidance where feasible, or appropriate study, handling, and recordation of such resources. Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 also outlines the procedures established in the California Health and Safety Code for human remains. Adherence to these measures would reduce potential impacts to these resources or human remains to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.9-16)

Impact 3.4.9 (Disturb, Damage, or Destroy As-Yet Unknown Unique Paleontological Resources During Project Construction): The Proposed Project could result in damage or destruction of as-yet unknown paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 Monitor for Paleontological Resources, Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Paleontologist

The paleontological report prepared for the Proposed Project included identification of fossiliferous Turlock Lake and Riverbank formations within portions of the project site, beginning approximately two feet below ground surface and continuing up to eight feet below ground surface. Because fossil localities cannot be predicted without actually disturbing a rock unit, a qualified

professional paleontologist (as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) shall be retained to provide awareness training for construction personnel involved in earth-moving activities. Construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities shall be informed that fossils could be discovered during excavation that these fossils are protected by laws, on the appearance of common fossils, and on proper notification procedures should fossils be discovered.

In addition, a qualified professional paleontologist shall monitor earth-moving during the initial project grading that impacts sediment greater than two feet (0.6 meters) in depth in areas with mapped Turlock Lake or Riverbank formation geologic units to observe the stratigraphy and any fossils exposed by excavation. This shall not be required in areas where sediments will be buried but not otherwise be disturbed. If no evidence of fossils is seen in the initial grading, a program of periodic spot checks of the deepest excavations or those judged most likely to disturb fossils shall be instituted until excavations have been completed. Should any evidence of paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) be encountered, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the discovery, and the City shall be notified immediately. At that time, the paleontologist shall assess the resource and provide appropriate management recommendations. Recommendations shall include, but are not limited to, salvage and treatment as described by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). This treatment shall include preparation, identification, determination of significance, and curation into a public museum.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

In areas where geological formations are not exposed, paleontological resources are typically not visible but may be present. Much of the project site is capped by two feet of plow-disturbed soils. Below this plow zone, the project site is underlain by a one-foot- to six-foot-thick stratum of Turlock Lake and/or Riverbank formation sediments, either of which could include fossil resources.

During the paleontological survey for the Proposed Project in 2011, ichnofossils and fossilized plant fragments were identified in Turlock Lake Formation sediments along University Creek. These fossil discoveries suggest a high potential for additional similar fossil remains to be impacted by project construction.

If exposed, fossils in these formations could be damaged or destroyed during site preparation, similar to archaeological resources. If such resources are encountered during construction either on-site or within the off-site improvements areas, they could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of data potential. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

Unlike some archaeological resources, which can be identified readily, paleontological resources may not be recognized except by a qualified paleontologist, necessitating a program of worker training and construction monitoring. If evidence of paleontological resources is uncovered during project development, Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 requires that all work cease within 100 feet of the

find so that fossils are not further damaged by equipment. Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 reduces impacts to unique paleontological resources as defined by CEQA. Adherence to these measures would reduce the potential impacts to these resources to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.9-17)

Impact 3.4.9 (Damage or Destroy Historical, Archaeological, Prehistoric, or Unique Paleontological Resources during Construction of Off-Site Infrastructure): Historic resources, prehistoric resources, and/or paleontological resources could be located within areas that would be disturbed during construction of off-site infrastructure.

Mitigation 4.9-2 (a) and (b) Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist is set forth in full in Section 3.8.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-2.

Mitigation 4.9-3 Monitor for Paleontological Resources, Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Paleontologist is set forth in full in Section 3.8.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-3.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-4 Conduct Appropriate Off-Site Studies

Prior to undertaking construction of off-site infrastructure, the City shall determine whether or not cultural resource surveys have been undertaken for any areas to be disturbed during construction. If surveys were conducted, the City shall document that any identified resources were treated as recommended in the studies. If no studies or surveys were conducted, the City shall ensure that a qualified archaeologist conducts the appropriate level of study. If significant resources or significant archaeological sites are present, they shall be avoided, as feasible. If avoidance of such resources is not feasible, recordation of the sites shall be required, along with treatment as is recommended by the archaeologist after consultation with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and, if the find is prehistoric, NAHC. If unknown resources are encountered during construction, recommendations, including the possible management recommendations listed in Mitigation Measures 4.9-2 and 4.9-3, shall be implemented to ensure that the resources are avoided, protected, and/or recorded.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development of the Proposed Project would require infrastructure improvements outside of the project site, such as extension of water, wastewater, recycled water, natural gas lines, power lines, and roadway extensions (Westbrook Boulevard). In most cases, offsite infrastructure would be located within existing or planned roadway rights-of-way, and the potential for cultural resources to occur would have been addressed during the planning of those roads, but there may be exceptions.

Although overall infrastructure needs and general off-site infrastructure locations have been identified for the Proposed Project, the precise alignments and design of off-site improvements cannot be determined at the Plan-level phase of development. Project-level plans will be developed

in the future, as overall development in the project site progresses and the need for the infrastructure arises. Because the precise alignments and design of the off-site improvements have yet to be determined—and cannot be determined at the Plan-level phase of analysis—additional cultural resource surveys may need to be completed for small areas of land. Therefore, this analysis assumes that historic resources (both subsurface and buildings), prehistoric resources (primarily sub-surface), and/or paleontological resources could be located within areas that would be disturbed during construction of off-site infrastructure. If encountered during grading, excavation, and construction, such resources could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a direct loss and/or loss of integrity. This is a **potentially significant** impact

Mitigation Measure 4.9-4 requires that appropriate studies be conducted prior to construction of off-site infrastructure, and if any historical resources, unique archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or prehistoric resources are found that they be evaluated for significance, and avoided, preserved, and/or recorded as appropriate. This is consistent with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines for determining significance and PRC section 21803 (b)-(f) regarding preservation and recording. In addition, Mitigation Measures 4.9-2 and 4.9-3 would ensure that work will cease if cultural or paleontological resources are discovered during construction, until such resources can be evaluated and treated as warranted by their significance. These mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.9-18)

Impact 4.9-5 (Cumulative Impacts to Cultural and Paleontological Resources): Construction of the Proposed Project could result in damage or destruction of as-yet unknown cultural or paleontological resources.

Mitigation 4.9-1 Conduct Archaeological Survey of Urban Reserve Parcel is set forth in full in Section 3.8.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-1.

Mitigation 4.9-2 (a) and (b) Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist is set forth in full in Section 3.8.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-2.

Mitigation 4.9-3 Monitor for Paleontological Resources, Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Paleontologist is set forth in full in Section 3.4.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-3.

Mitigation 4.9-4 Conduct Appropriate Off-Site Studies is set forth in full in Section 3.8.8 in relation to Impact 4.9-4.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The cumulative geographic context for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts to cultural resources consists of the City of Roseville and western Placer County. Cultural and paleontological resources have been recorded near the project site, and project construction could result in the

damage or destruction of as-yet unknown cultural or paleontological resources. This is considered a **potentially significant** cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measures 4.9-1 and 4.9-4 would reduce the Proposed Project's contributions to cumulative cultural resources impacts by ensuring that appropriate surveys are conducted with the Urban Reserve and off-site improvement areas to identify cultural resources, and that cultural resources discovered during surveys are properly recorded and handled. Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 would further reduce the Proposed Project contributions to cumulative cultural resources impacts by ensuring that unknown cultural resources or human remains discovered within the project site are avoided or properly recorded and handled if discovered during construction. With mitigation, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to historic and archaeological resources would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 would reduce the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative paleontological resources impacts by ensuring that fossils discovered within the project site are avoided, recorded, or otherwise treated, if discovered during construction. With mitigation, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.9-19)

3.8.9. Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

Impact 4.10-1 (Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment through the Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or through Reasonably Foreseeable Upset or Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment): Construction activities could result in the release of hazardous materials, if one or more of the existing hazardous materials are not handled or removed appropriately.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination and Existing Hazardous Materials within the ARSP

As a condition of approval of the ARSP, the following recommendations from the Phase I ESA for the project site (ENGEO, 2006) shall be completed prior to issuance of grading permits:

1. Stained soil observed beneath one of the 5-gallon buckets used to store Tech 2000 Mineral Gear Oil shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.
2. Stained soil measuring approximately 1 foot in diameter beneath one of the above-ground fuel storage tanks next to the steel silo in the northern portion of the property shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.
3. The 21 55-gallon steel drums near the farm facility shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.
4. A statistically significant number of soil samples shall be collected from the surface soil within the boundaries of the proposed school site and analyzed for agricultural chemicals per EPA guidelines.

5. Should the results indicate the presence of a statistically significant concentration of agricultural chemicals with the potential to cause harm to sensitive receptors (such as school children), a Phase II ESA shall be conducted to determine the extent of the contamination and provide recommendation to remediate the school site. In consultation with DTSC, the proponent of the school development shall develop a workplan based on the recommendations of the Phase II ESA to remediate the project site.
6. Debris at various locations across the project site shall be removed and properly disposed of.
7. The burn wood pile measuring approximately 500 feet long by 6 feet tall by 6 feet wide along the southern portion of the project site shall be removed prior to construction at the project site.
8. If evidence of further soil contamination, septic tanks, or other underground storage tanks are encountered in the project site, work shall cease until the area can be tested by a qualified professional meeting EPA's definition of an Environmental Professional under the All Appropriate Inquiries Rule in accordance with CERCLA. The qualified professional shall provide recommendations for further remediation in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. if necessary, contaminated materials shall be removed and properly disposed or remediated, and regulatory site closure obtained. Remediation activities could include removal of contaminated soil, and/or treatment. The City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities are coordinated with the RFD, PCDEH, and if needed, other appropriate federal, state and local agencies. Once a site is remediated to the satisfaction of the appropriate regulatory agency, construction can continue.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination and Existing Hazardous Materials within the Urban Reserve Parcel

Development proposals for the Urban Reserve parcel shall include a Phase I ESA and require that recommended testing and remediation identified in the Phase I ESA be performed. City conditions of approval shall require that, if evidence of soil contamination is encountered in the area of the Urban Reserve proposed to be developed, work shall cease until the area can be tested, and, if necessary, be remediated. As part of this process, the City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities conducted in the Urban Reserve parcel are coordinated with the RFD, PCDEH, and if needed, other appropriate state and/or local agencies. Once a site is remediated, construction may continue.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Hazardous materials regulations were established at the state level to ensure compliance with federal regulations to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of

hazardous substances. These regulations must be implemented by employers and businesses, and are monitored by Cal OSHA in the workplace, DTSC for hazardous waste, and RFD.

Implementation of existing General Plan Safety Element hazardous materials policies that address hazardous materials disclosure, compliance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations that are administered and enforced by the CUPA, and compliance with RFD standards would reduce impacts associated with the routine use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

Hazardous Materials Usage and Handling during Construction

Hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction and operations within the project site. Construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable federal and state environmental and workplace safety laws. In addition, the SWPPP required to be developed for construction activities within the project site will would contain provisions to prevent co-mingling of construction-related hazardous substances with surface waters, including stormwater runoff. Adherence to these regulatory requirements would ensure that the potential for hazardous materials releases during construction would be a less-than-significant impact.

Exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials could occur through improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes during construction or operation of the Proposed Project, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accidents; improper disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. In addition, construction workers could be exposed to hazardous materials, such as asbestos dust, lead paint chips, and lead dust, through demolition of the existing structures on the project site.

However, project compliance with the CARB and NESHAP requirements for asbestos abatement in structures containing ACMs, as well as implementation of DTSC and Cal OSHA requirements for removing structures with lead-based paint, would prevent release into the environment. Compliance with Cal OSHA and DTSC requirements for employee training and monitoring would reduce potential impacts to construction workers from hazardous materials usage and handling to a less-than-significant level.

Discovery of Contaminated Soil or Groundwater during Construction

Under the Proposed Project the existing wells would be demolished and the existing sewage system would be abandoned. Although no potential environmental concerns were identified at these sites in the Phase I ESA, contaminated soil or groundwater may be present. Hazardous materials could be released during construction if one or more of these existing hazardous materials are not handled or removed appropriately. While the risk is low, there is a potential that soil-disturbing activities could expose construction workers or the environment to contaminated debris or elevated levels of hazardous chemicals or that hazardous substances would be spread inadvertently, resulting in a greater aerial extent of contamination. In addition, with the previous use of the site as agricultural land, widespread use of associated chemicals, including, but not

limited to, herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers, may have occurred within the designated school site. Soil containing elevated levels of contaminants, if left unmanaged, would pose a health risk to future occupants and users of the site. It is also possible that existing septic tanks, wells, or other underground storage devices that have not been identified could have been installed prior to permitting or closure requirements. The potential for hazardous material contamination is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

Implementation of applicable regulations in Title 40 CFR by the Applicant, under the oversight of the CUPA, DTSC, and/or the RWQCB, would ensure that any soil contamination from past uses would be investigated and disposed of, or remediated, according to established protocols. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 requires that the recommendations provided in the Phase I ESA be incorporated as a condition of approval of the ARSP. Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 requires that a Phase I ESA be conducted for the Urban Reserve parcel and recommendations implemented prior to approval of development within that parcel. With the implementation of these measures, impacts associated with the potential release of previously identified hazardous materials within the project site would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.10-15)

Impact 4.10-4 (Potential for Cumulative Effects Associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials): The Proposed Project and related projects would all involve the storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials during construction and operation.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination and Existing Hazardous Materials within the ARSP is set forth in full in Section 3.8.9 in relation to Impact 4.10-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination and Existing Hazardous Materials within the Urban Reserve Parcel is set forth in full in Section 3.8.9 in relation to Impact 4.10-1.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

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 related to these activities are extensively regulated by various federal, state, and local agencies, and it is assumed that related projects would also comply with these hazardous materials regulations. Reduction of project-related impacts through compliance with laws and regulations, and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2, as discussed under Impact 4.10-1, would ensure that operation and construction activities would not result in impacts that would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant** with mitigation. (DEIR 4.10-21)

3.8.10. Public Utilities – Water

Impact 4.12.1-1 (Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Demand): The City's water supply of 58,900 AFY is not sufficient to serve all of the projected demand under full buildout of the General Plan plus the Proposed Project's demand.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.1-1 Secure Adequate Water Supply

Prior to the approval of building permits, proponents of the Proposed Project will provide their proportionate share of required funding to the City for the acquisition and delivery of treated potable and recycled water supplies to the Proposed Project area. Additionally, prior to the approval of building permits, the City shall enter into agreement with PCWA to acquire water supplies of sufficient quantity to serve the ARSP as described in the EIR and WSA. The identified source would need to be legally available and sufficient to meet the demand of the Proposed Project, consistent with the WFA and City policies and California Water Code Section 10910 et seq. and Government Code Section 66473.7 subject to a completed environmental review, approved by the agency with jurisdiction over the source, and funded.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The City's water supply entitlements are allocated to a project at the time they are approved rather than at the time they are constructed, this analysis conservatively bases the availability of water supplies assuming buildout of the City's General Plan and approved specific plans. At buildout of the City's General Plan, citywide potable water demands are estimated to be 58,590 AFY. Development of the ARSP in combination with projected potable water demand for buildout of the City would be 59,651 AFY (58,590 AFY + 1,061 AFY). Therefore, in normal/wet years, the City's water supply of 58,900 AFY (see Table 4.12.1-2) is not sufficient to serve all of the projected demand under full buildout of the General Plan plus the Proposed Project's demand. When compared to the total projected potable water demand of 59,651 AFY, there is a shortage of 751 AFY of water at buildout. Since there is a shortage during normal/wet years, there would be an even greater shortage during driest (critically dry) years due to the additional restrictions under the WFA. Therefore, as concluded in the WSA (Appendix E) the City does not currently have adequate surface water supplies to meet the additional demands of the Proposed Project at buildout of the General Plan; this is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

The amount of potable water needed to service the project site (1,061 AFY) has been rounded up to 1,500 AFY to give the City some long-term flexibility with its water supply. Mitigation Measure 4.12.1-1 requires that an agreement between the City and PCWA be entered into prior to the approval of any building permits to ensure that sufficient water supplies are acquired before the additional demand of the Proposed Project starts to occur. In the unlikely event that the City is unable to enter into an agreement with PCWA for water to serve ARSP, water will have to be obtained through another source such as the proposed SRWRP, described above. If this occurs,

additional environmental review would be required. The SRWRP alternative is being considered to serve cumulative conditions in 2035; therefore, additional information on the SRWRP is included within Impact 4.12.1-8.

With the proposed acquisition of 1,500 AFY of new surface water supplies obtained from PCWA in accordance with the City's General Plan (Mitigation Measure 4.12.1-1), there would be sufficient water supplies to serve the Proposed Project in all years (Normal, Single Dry, Multiple Dry water years); therefore, water supply impacts are considered **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.12.1-40)

Impact 4.12.1-4 (Capacity of Water Treatment System to Meet Potable Water Demand): ARSP would contribute to the need to develop the Ophir WTP, would result in significant environmental impacts.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

City of Roseville Water Treatment Plant

Under agreement between PCWA and the City of Roseville, currently available capacity at the Barton Road WTP may be made available for the Proposed Project on an interim basis to allow funding of Ophir WTP at a later date, subject to Ophir WTP being on-line in time for the Barton Road WTP to serve other planned demands. Consequently, near-term impacts are considered less than significant.

PCWA Water Treatment System

The ARSP would require PCWA to treat an additional 1,500 AFY or 1.3 mgd of water to meet Proposed Project buildout water demands. Using the maximum day peaking factor of 2.0 described above, 2.6 mgd of treatment capacity would be needed to serve build out of the Proposed Project. Long-term WTP capacity for the Foothills/Sunset/Ophir Area would be provided by the construction of the future Ophir WTP.

The construction of the Ophir WTP (previously referred to as the Foothill Phase II WTP and Pipeline Project) was addressed in the Foothill Phase II WTP and Pipeline EIR (Ophir WTP EIR). The Ophir WTP EIR is incorporated into this document by reference, as described within Section 1.4 of the DEIR. The findings of the Ophir WTP EIR were that construction-related activities (including site grading) would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions, which would adversely affect air quality. These impacts to air quality were determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, impacts to the remaining issues analyzed by the EIR were found either to

be less than significant or would be reduced to less than significant through the implementation of adopted mitigation measures.

Because the ARSP would contribute to the need to develop the Ophir WTP, which would result in significant environmental impacts, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without contributing to the need to develop the Ophir WTP and mitigation to a less-than-significant level is infeasible, the short-term cumulative impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.12.1-47.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant short-term impacts related to the Proposed Project's incremental impact of development of the Ophir WTP.

Impact 4.12.1-8 (Cumulative Water Supply and Water Treatment Impacts): Development of the Proposed Project, along with foreseeable future development within the City of Roseville, would exceed the City's currently contracted surface water supply.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the Final EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Water Supply

Development of the Proposed Project, along with other foreseeable future development within the City of Roseville (which includes buildout of the City's existing General Plan, the ARSP Area, the CSP Area, and Hewlett Packard/Campus Oaks Project), would exceed the City's currently contracted surface water supplies. This is a **significant** impact.

The cumulative analysis for water supply, distribution, and storage considers the potential environmental effects of supplying water to the Proposed Project in addition to regional water demands generated in Sacramento County, South Placer County, and Western El Dorado County under the provisions of the WFA. The analysis also considers other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and regulations that govern regional water supply operations.

Two scenarios have been identified for securing additional water supplies to meet the buildout demand under future cumulative conditions.

<u>Scenario 1</u>

"Scenario 1" would consist of the full utilization of the City's American River supply allocated by the WFA, with an additional 10 mgd of water acquired through an agreement with PCWA. Because the City's WFA allocation is subject to CVP deficiencies under drier year types, the additional

water demands under future cumulative conditions may require groundwater pumping in years when the City receives less than a full surface water allocation.

Impacts that would result from construction of infrastructure necessary to treat and deliver additional PCWA water from the proposed Ophir WTP to the City of Roseville were disclosed in the Ophir WTP EIR and PVSP EIR. These EIRs are incorporated by reference, as discussed in Section 1.4, concluded that there would be potential environmental impacts in the following areas: agricultural resources, aesthetics/light and glare, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, traffic/transportation, air quality, noise, public services, and hazards/hazardous materials. Mitigation measures were developed to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels with the exception of the following impact to Air Quality, which would remain significant and unavoidable: Direct construction related air emissions (dust from earthmoving and NOx from construction vehicle exhaust). Because cumulative development would require the development of infrastructure to treat and deliver water, which would result in significant unavoidable impacts, the project's contribution towards the need to construct water delivery infrastructure and potable water treatment for the Proposed Project is conservatively considered to be cumulatively considerable and thus **significant**.

The potential mitigation measures that may be available to reduce the SRWRS-related contributions to significant impacts are unknown at this time. Because demands from the Proposed Project will contribute to overall City demands under the cumulative scenario, the City conservatively assumes that the project's incremental contributions to the above-referenced significant unavoidable cumulative impacts under this scenario are themselves cumulatively considerable and thus significant.

Under Scenario 1, the water demand associated with buildout of the City's General Plan and the Proposed Project would be supplied by existing and assured sources of surface water allocated under its WFA, and groundwater to make up shortfalls in surface water deliveries during drought years. An EIR was prepared for the WFA that addresses impacts and mitigation measures resulting from implementation of the water supply program outlined in the WFA. The WFA EIR listed the flow-related environmental impacts that could occur when implementing water diversions under the WFA and concluded that there was the possibility for environmental impacts in the following areas: groundwater resources, water supply, water quality, fisheries and aquatic habitat, flood control, hydropower supply, vegetation and wildlife, recreation, land use and growth inducement, aesthetics, cultural resources, soils and geology. While mitigation measures were identified and adopted, some impacts remained significant even after feasible mitigation measures would be applied. The following presents the future significant cumulative impacts identified in the WFA EIR, which represents the impacts that would occur as a result of cumulative development in the region, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the project site and development of the cumulative projects and/or development levels identified above.

WFA EIR Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts

- Water Supply
- Decrease in deliveries to SWP customers
- Decrease in deliveries to CVP customers
- Water Quality
- Sacramento River and Delta Water Quality
- Fishery Resources and Aquatic Habitat
- Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's warm water fisheries
- Impacts to Fall-run Chinook salmon
- Flow and temperature related impacts to splittail (February-May)
- Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's and Trinity Reservoir's warmwater fisheries
- Temperature related impacts to Sacramento River fishery resources
- Impacts to Delta fish populations
- Hydropower Supply
- Reduced CVP hydropower capacity and generation
- Increased energy requirements for diverters pumping from Folsom Reservoir (economic impact)
- Recreation
- Impacts on Lower American recreation opportunities (rafting and boating)
- Reduced Folsom Reservoir boating opportunities
- Reduced availability of Folsom reservoir swimming beaches
- Cultural Resources
- Physical deterioration of cultural resources in Folsom Reservoir

The water demand created by the Proposed Project, which is estimated to be approximately 1,061 AFY, would represent 0.27 percent of the total WFA delivery agreements.

Consequently, the diversion of additional surface water in wet year-types to meet the Proposed Project's demand would contribute negligibly to the overall cumulative impacts assessed in the WFA EIR. Even so, the City conservatively assumes that the Proposed Project's incremental contributions to the above referenced significant unavoidable effects are themselves cumulatively considerable and thus **significant**.

Scenario 2

"Scenario 2" would consist of the City participating in the SRWRS to divert additional water from the Sacramento River. Similar to Scenario 1, due to CVP cutbacks to the City's WFA allocation in drier year types, Scenario 2 also would require groundwater pumping in years when the City receives less than a full surface water allocation in order to meet the City's cumulative demand.

There are four primary alternatives under consideration by the SRWRS. These alternatives were analyzed in the final version of the Sacramento River Water Reliability Study Initial Alternatives

Report (Alternatives Report) dated March 2005. According to the Alternatives Report, the Elverta Diversion Alternative includes the construction of a joint diversion for PCWA, SSWD, and the Cities of Sacramento and Roseville. It would pump water from the Sacramento River to be treated at a proposed Elverta Water Treatment Facility. Under this alternative, new diversion facilities would be constructed near the existing Natomas Mutual Water Company's Elkhorn Diversion. Additionally, the water treatment facility, storage, and pumping facilities would be located near the river with transmission lines connecting to the existing Cooperative Transmission Pipeline/Northridge Transmission Pipeline in Antelope, which serves the SSWD, as well as extend north with service to Roseville and PCWA.

Based on available information, future significant cumulative effects are conservatively expected as a result of implementation of the SRWRS in the following issue areas:

- Biological Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Recreation
- Land Use

Cumulative impacts in the resource areas listed above are expected to occur as a result of cumulative development in the region under Scenario 2, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the Proposed Project, and development of the cumulative projects and/or development levels identified above. To date these effects have not been fully evaluated in a certified or adopted CEQA document. Because under Scenario 2 cumulative development could require the treatment of water from the SRWRS Project, the construction of which is expected to result in significant unavoidable impacts, the contribution associated with construction of water delivery infrastructure and potable water treatment for ARSP is conservatively considered to be cumulatively considerable and thus **significant**.

The potential mitigation measures that may be available to reduce the SRWRS-related contributions to significant impacts are unknown at this time. Because demands from the Proposed Project will contribute to overall City demands under the cumulative scenario, the City conservatively assumes that the project's incremental contributions to the above-referenced significant unavoidable cumulative impacts under this scenario are themselves cumulatively considerable and thus significant.

Potable Water Treatment

The Proposed Project's impacts to the Barton Road WTP and PCWA WTPs are discussed in Impact 4.12.1-4. The analysis within Impact 4.12.1-4 considered the buildout of the City of Roseville and PCWA's Western Area currently served by the Foothill and Sunset WTPs. Under cumulative conditions, there is insufficient treatment capacity for buildout of PCWA's Western Area. To address this shortfall, PCWA has planned the development and operation of the Ophir WTP. Because the Proposed Project would contribute to the need to develop the Ophir WTP,

which would result in **significant environmental** impacts, long-term impacts are considered **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.12-55)

3.8.11. Public Utilities – Waste Water

Impact 4.12.3-2 (Capacity of Wastewater Treatment Facility): The Proposed Project would contribute to the need to expand the PGWWTP.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-1 Treatment Plant Capacity

Prior to issuance of building permits for development in the ARSP, the applicant shall demonstrate to the City that the SPWA has approved expansion of the SPWA 2005 SAB to include the ARSP. All applicants shall participate financially in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows through payment of connection fees. Applicant shall also participate on a fair share basis in other financial mechanisms for any additional environmental review required to secure approvals necessary to increase wastewater discharges from the plant, including approval by the SPWA for expansion of the service area boundary. It is recognized that the ARSP applicant shall rely on the City (on behalf of the SPWA partners) to construct regional treatment and regional transmission facilities needed to treat and discharge wastewater produced within the service area boundary. In the event the City is unable to obtain all required permits (e.g. NPDES permit and WDRs) or is unable to complete the required facility expansion(s), development within the service area boundary may continue until existing capacity has been exhausted, at which time any remaining development shall be curtailed until such time as sufficient wastewater treatment and discharge capacity becomes available.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

The ARSP is projected to generate wastewater flows of 0.554 mgd, while the combined total wastewater flows for the ARSP and Toad Hill Ranches are projected to be 0.606 gmd. This would bring total ADWF at the PGWWTP to 20.036 mgd.

The WRSP Final EIR evaluated wastewater treatment impacts associated with expansion of wastewater treatment facilities up to 24.7 mgd ADWF. The total projected wastewater flows to the PGWWTP listed in the table above would not exceed the flows previously analyzed in Section 4.11, Impact 4.11-7 of the WRSP Final EIR, which is incorporated into this document by reference, as described within Section 1.4 of this EIR, and summarized below.

As disclosed in the WRSP Final EIR, the construction of additional treatment facilities would be needed to accommodate growth. WWTP capacity must be expanded prior to developing residences and nonresidential uses that would cause total wastewater flows from the ARSP together with other projects to exceed the existing treatment capacity of the PGWWTP. Increasing wastewater treatment capacity of the PGWWTP to accommodate planned growth in the regional service area and the ARSP will require expansion of the treatment facilities. As described in General Plan

Policy 3, the City of Roseville will initiate expansion efforts at the time the PGWWTP nears 75 percent capacity. A 20-acre City-owned parcel on the south side of the PGWWTP was identified as part of the WRSP to accommodate future expansion of the PGWWTP. The significant environmental effects of this future expansion was analyzed in the WRSP EIR. The proposed ARSP's contribution to the expansion of PGWWTP, in combination with other development in the region would add to the need to expand the facility. This is a **potentially significant** impact.

The WRSP Final EIR identified mitigation measure WMM 4.11-5 to reduce this impact to a less-than significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-1, Treatment Plant Capacity by the ARSP applicant, which duplicates mitigation measure WMM 4.11-5 adopted with the WRSP, requires the ARSP applicant to pay connection fees for all ARSP development, which will contribute to the planned PGWWTP expansion. This will allow for capacity expansion of the PGWWTP as necessary to accommodate development within the ARSP and will reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.12.3-12)

Impact 4.12.3-3 (Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities): The Proposed Project would contribute to the need to expand the PGWWTP.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Expansion

The City shall implement all relevant construction related mitigation measures for expansion of the PGWWTP listed in Appendix V and all water quality and aquatic resource mitigation measures applicable to this project as listed in DEIR Table 4.12.3-4.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

As identified in Impact 4.12.3-2 above, the capacity of the PGWWTP would need to be expanded to accommodate development within the project site. In accordance with Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems General Plan Policy 3, the City of Roseville will initiate expansion studies to determine necessary improvements to meet projected wastewater treatment demands upon 75 percent utilization of the treatment plants capacity. However, as discussed above, the potential impacts of treating and discharging effluent up to 29.5 mgd ADWF and the impacts of expanding the PGWWTP up to 24.7 mgd ADWF were previously addressed the WWMP EIR and the WRSP Final EIR, incorporated herein by reference, as described within Section 1.4 of this EIR.

As concluded within the WRSP Final EIR, the majority of impacts from construction and operation of expansion of the PGWWTP would be less than significant, or could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation identified in the WWMP EIR. However, the WRSP Final EIR determined that the following impacts, which were originally identified in the WWMP EIR, may not be reduced to less-than-significant levels after application of recommended mitigation and would, therefore, remain significant:

- Loss of vernal pools/seasonal wetlands, and impacts to vernal pool special status species;
- Loss of raptor habitat;
- Odor and noise emissions at PGWWTP;
- Increased criteria air pollutant emissions due to subsequent development; and
- Disposal of sludge at the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-2, Treatment Plant Expansion, requires that all appropriate construction related mitigation measures identified in the WWMP EIR be implemented as part of expanding the PGWWTP to reduce construction related impacts. Nevertheless, as listed above, some environmental impacts of the expansion would remain significant after mitigation. Because the ARSP would contribute to the need to expand the PGWWTP, which would result in significant environmental impacts, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Because it is impossible to allow development of the Proposed Project without expansion of the PGWWTP and mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.12.3-14.) As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to need for expansion of the PGWWTP.

Impact 4.12.3-4 (Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the RWQCB): The ARSP would contribute to water quality impacts associated with discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-1 Treatment Plant Capacity is set forth in full in Section 3.8.11 in relation to Impact 4.12.3-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Expansion is set forth in full in Section 3.8.11 in relation to Impact 4.12.3-3.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Wastewater flows from the ARSP and Toad Hill Ranches plus buildout of the 2005 SAB, including the recently approved Regional University Specific Plan, the ARSP, and CSP are expected to generate 20.036 mgd ADWF of wastewater to be treated at the PGWWTP, which will have sufficient capacity upon expansion. The impacts of discharging up to 29.5 mgd ADWF were previously addressed in the WWMP EIR. In addition, a technical memorandum titled Cumulative Analysis of UGA Impacts on Water Quality and Aquatic Resources in Pleasant Grove Creek, Roseville, California, by Merritt Smith Consulting dated January 15, 2006 (Merritt Smith Tech Memo), was prepared to evaluate the cumulative impacts associated with treatment and discharge from a water quality and aquatic resources perspective of foreseeable wastewater flows from future UGAs (e.g. discharge of flow outside the 2005 SAB) to the PGWWTP including Curry Creek,

Regional University, Orchard Creek, Placer Ranch, Enviro Tech, Sierra Vista, and CSP. The Merritt Smith Tech Memo calculated the estimated future ADWF from the PGWWTP 2005 Service Area plus flow from these UGAs located outside the 2005 SAB as 23.4 mgd. This estimate is 6.1 mgd less than the 29.5 mgd future flow projected for the PGWWTP in the WWMP EIR, but 3.364 mgd more than anticipated from the proposed ARSP calculations.

The ARSP's contribution to these impacts is considered significant. Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-1,

Treatment Plant Capacity, requires that prior to issuance of building permits for development in the project site, the applicant shall demonstrate to the City that the SPWA has approved expansion of the SPWA 2005 SAB to include the ARSP. All applicants shall participate financially in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows through payment of connection fees. In addition, City compliance with the measures listed above and with the NPDES permit would reduce impacts associated with an increased demand for discharge of the treated effluent from the PGWWTP by ensuring that water quality standards are met. Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-2, Treatment Plant Expansion, requires that the applicant and/or the City, as specified, shall implement all relevant construction related mitigation measures for expansion of the PGWWTP listed in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program, included in Appendix V, and all water quality and aquatic resource mitigation measures applicable to this project as listed in Table 4.12.3-4. Additionally, Chapter 14.26 of the City's Municipal Code prohibits discharge to any sanitary sewer of any pollutant or wastewater that would interfere with the operation or performance of the City's wastewater collection or treatment facilities. Future expansion(s) of the PGWWTP would require modifications to the plant's NPDES permit. Compliance with the modified permit and enforcement of the City's Municipal Code would reduce water quality impacts associated with increased effluence discharges to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.12.3-16)

Impact 4.12.3-5 (Cumulative Wastewater Impacts): Development of the Proposed Project would contribute to the need for expansion of PGWWTP or DCWWTP.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-1 Treatment Plant Capacity is set forth in full in Section 3.8.11 in relation to Impact 4.12.3-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.3-2 Treatment Plant Expansion is set forth in full in Section 3.8.11 in relation to Impact 4.12.3-3.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Wastewater from the Proposed Project and other regional projects would be treated at either the PGWWTP or DCWWTP. Potential expansion of both the PGWWTP and DCWWTP were identified in the Roseville WWMP EIR. Additionally expansion at the PGWWTP was identified in the WRSP Final EIR completed in 2004. Expansion of either plant to serve the flows resulting

from regional growth could result in environmental impacts associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek or Dry Creek. The NPDES discharge permit for either WWTP would need to be amended to reflect higher flows. The construction and operation of additional wastewater treatment facilities, as well as wastewater collection systems to areas where such facilities do not exist, could result in potentially significant environmental effects. Each development proposal that comes forward would be subject to environmental review on a project-by-project basis. Similar to impacts relating to the expansion of the PGWWTP above, the construction of additional wastewater treatment and collection facilities, where such facilities do not exist, could result in indirect growth effects (e.g., traffic, air, and noise), which could be **significant and unavoidable** on a cumulative basis. Therefore, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. The project's incremental contribution to cumulative environmental impacts associated with expansion of wastewater treatment and collection facilities is considered **significant** even after mitigation. As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts associated with expansion of wastewater treatment and collection facilities.

3.8.12. Public Utilities – Solid Waste

Impact 4.12.4-5 (Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts): Waste from the Proposed Project in combination with other cumulative development would shorten the lifespan of the WRSL and MRF.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact is identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Currently the MRF has permitted processing capacity up to 1,750 tons per day and the WRSL is anticipated to be able to accept waste until 2058. However, the need for processing capacity at the MRF and for a final closure date at the WRSL would be influenced by several factors including: regional growth rates, economic conditions, and the efficiency of waste recovery. Depending on these factors, waste from the Proposed Project in combination with other cumulative development, would shorten the lifespan of the MRF and the WRSL. Similar to the Proposed Project, development within the service area of the WRSL would be required to pay collection fees, a portion of which is used to service bonds necessary to fund WRSL expansions. However, expansion of the WRSL would create environmental effects. Plans for expansion of WRSL capacity beyond 2058 have not been developed; therefore, specific impacts cannot be identified at

this time. Because of the identified expansion site's proximity to the existing WRSL, however, it can be anticipated that the impacts of an expansion would be similar to those attributed to the existing WRSL. There would be construction-related impacts such as air pollutant emissions, noise, and erosion. In addition, agricultural land and biological resources, including wetlands, could be lost. Once constructed, the expanded WRSL could create additional odors; traffic; operational air pollutant emissions, including increased emissions of WRSL gas and combustion flare emissions; litter; night lighting and other changes in visual character; and degradation of surface and groundwater quality. These impacts would be similar to those of the existing WRSL and, where significant, could be reduced by mitigation measures already required of the WRSL and the solid waste facilities permitting process. However, there could be impacts, such as the loss of biological and agricultural resources that would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation. Further, since the City of Roseville does not control the WPWMA and the ability to expand the WRSL, the Proposed Project's contribution to this cumulative impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR 4.12.4-12)

3.8.13. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 4.13-1 (Erosion and Runoff from Construction Sites Containing Soils or Other Materials Could Degrade Water Quality if Discharged to Local Streams): Development activities associated with the ARSP could cause soil erosion at accelerated rates.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 Implementation of Construction Activity Stormwater Standards

Prior to the issuance of a City grading permit and the commencement of construction activities, the Applicant shall demonstrate to the City compliance with the SWRCB NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit), the City of Roseville's Construction Standards, and the City's Stormwater BMP Guidance Manual. The SWRCB requires that all construction sites have adequate control measures to reduce the discharge of sediment and other pollutants to streams to ensure compliance with Section 303 of the CWA. To comply with the NPDES permit, the Applicant shall file a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB and prepare a SWPPP prior to construction, which includes a detailed, site-specific listing of the potential sources of stormwater pollution; pollution prevention measures (erosion and sediment control measures and measures to control non-stormwater discharges and hazardous spills) to include a description of the type and location of erosion and sediment control BMPs to be implemented at the project site, and a BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule to determine the amount of pollutants leaving the project site. A copy of the SWPPP must be current and remain on the project site. Control measures are required prior to and throughout the rainy season. Water quality BMPs identified in the SWPPP could include but are not limited to the following:

- Temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, staked straw bales, and temporary revegetation) shall be employed for disturbed areas. No disturbed surfaces will be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.

- Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.
- A spill prevention and countermeasure plan shall be developed which would identify proper storage, collection, and disposal measures for potential pollutants (such as fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) used onsite. The plan would also require the proper storage, handling, use, and disposal of petroleum products.
- Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize land disturbance during peak runoff periods and to the immediate area required for construction. Soil conservation practices shall be completed during the fall or late winter to reduce erosion during spring runoff. Existing vegetation will be retained where possible. To the extent feasible, grading activities shall be limited to the immediate area required for construction.
- Surface water runoff shall be controlled by directing flowing water away from critical areas and by reducing runoff velocity. Diversion structures such as terraces, dikes, and ditches shall collect and direct runoff water around vulnerable areas to prepared drainage outlets. Surface roughening, berms, check dams, hay bales, or similar devices shall be used to reduce runoff velocity and erosion.
- Sediment shall be contained when conditions are too extreme for treatment by surface protection. Temporary sediment traps, filter fabric fences, inlet protectors, vegetative filters and buffers, or settling basins shall be used to detain runoff water long enough for sediment particles to settle out. Store, cover, and isolate construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals, to prevent runoff losses and contamination of groundwater.
- Topsoil removed during construction shall be carefully stored and treated as an important resource. Berms shall be placed around topsoil stockpiles to prevent runoff during storm events.
- Establish fuel and vehicle maintenance areas away from all drainage courses and design these areas to control runoff.
- Disturbed areas shall be revegetated after completion of construction activities.
- All necessary permits and approvals shall be obtained.
- Provide sanitary facilities for construction workers.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development activities associated with the ARSP would involve construction of structures, roadways, parking lots, and infrastructure (including off-site infrastructure), which would require grading, excavation, and other construction-related activities that could cause soil erosion at accelerated rates. Sediment from construction activities could accelerate erosion that could have adverse effects on receiving water quality on the project site and within downstream watersheds, including University Creek, Pleasant Grove Creek, and the Sacramento River. Such effects could include increased turbidity, which could result in adverse impacts on fish and wildlife and their

habitats, reduced pump life at Sacramento River water intakes due to abrasion, increased municipal water treatment costs for turbidity removal, and impaired recreation and aesthetic values. Another potential source of water quality degradation during construction activities is heavy machinery and other construction equipment. Construction equipment spills could result in the release of polluting constituents, such as heavy metals, oil, grease, and other petroleum hydrocarbons to University Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek. This is a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 requires the creation and implementation of a SWPPP and use of BMPs to minimize erosion and the risk of polluted runoff leaving the construction site. Further, compliance with the State's General Permit and the City Improvement Standards, combined with the City's inspection efforts under its MS4 Permit requirements, will ensure that construction-related sediment or other contaminants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable, as required by law. As a result, the Proposed Project would not result in the violation of any water quality standards, would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff, and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, this impact is **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.13-21)

Impact 4.13-2 (Changes in Surface Water Quality Resulting from Urban Stormwater Runoff and other Operational Activities): Increase in impervious surfaces resulting from development associated with the Proposed Project would increase the rate and amount of stormwater runoff that would carry urban pollutants.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 Changes in Surface Water Quality Resulting from Urban Stormwater Runoff and Other Operational Activities

At the tentative map or site development stage, development shall be conditioned to include source control and LID strategies, treatment control measures, including but not limited to bio-retention treatment as required by the City's then current design standards and the City's then current General Phase II MS4 Permit issued by the State. The measures shall include, but are not limited to, the measures identified in the Amoruso Drainage Master Plan. In addition, necessary erosion and sediment control measures for University Creek at Discharge Point E and monitoring of University Creek downstream of the discharge point shall be incorporated into the project design plans and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to receiving building/grading permits.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development associated with the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses including residences, schools, businesses, recreation, roadways, and parking areas. As discussed above, the increase in impervious surfaces resulting from the construction of buildings and paved areas would increase the rate and amount of stormwater runoff that would

carry urban pollutants into University Creek thence Pleasant Grove Creek. It is anticipated that runoff from the project site would be typical of urban runoff water quality.

Pollutants typically associated with urban uses include oil and grease, coliform bacteria, petroleum hydrocarbons, nitrogen, phosphorus, heavy metals, pesticides, herbicides, and other constituents.

Although some of the sediment load of developed areas would be reduced by implementing grassy swales, bio filters, and other measures, sources of pollution to stormwater runoff may still be present due to entrained dust on roadways and parking lots and blow over from open space areas and/or other off-site farming and construction activities. There is the potential that urban runoff from the Proposed Project could contain levels of pollutants that could adversely affect water quality in the local streams or increase sediment loads. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant**.

Compliance with the NPDES regulations and Mitigation Measure 4.13-2, which requires implementation of stormwater management, LID measures, and erosion control measures at University Creek, would ensure stormwater treatment devices specific to the land uses in the ARSP are implemented to the maximum extent practicable. Stormwater treatment devices will be chosen for their effectiveness in reducing urban pollutants in stormwater runoff to meet the Basin Plan and water quality objectives of the City's Phase II MS4 Permit. Taken together, all of these measures will avoid violation of any water quality standards, will avoid the creation of substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, and will avoid any substantial degradation of water quality. As a result, potential negative effects on water quality from urban runoff and project operational activities will be **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.13-23)

Impact 4.13-4 (Altered Drainage Patterns and Increase in the Rate of Stormwater Runoff through the Development of New Impervious Surfaces that Would Result in Flooding or Siltation On- or Off-Site): The increase in impervious surfaces would increase the rate of surface runoff conveyed through the site. In addition, development and grading would alter existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities on properties.

Mitigation Measure 4.13.5 Erosion Monitoring Plan

At the onset of any grading activities within the ARSP that increase the existing drainage area tributary to the University Creek channel within Al Johnson Wildlife Area, a geomorphologic assessment of University Creek through the Al Johnson Wildlife Area property shall be conducted.

The geomorphologic assessment shall include erosion protection measures, such as stream bank stabilization and velocity reduction measures, and the location for their implementation. The construction of the erosion protection measures shall be triggered by criteria established within the geomorphologic assessment.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Increased stormwater flows and altered drainage patterns as a result of development of the Proposed Project could increase the potential for localized flooding within the developed project site. Potential risks from localized flooding could result in property loss and disruptions of transportation corridors that would disrupt essential services into, out of, and through the project site.

Consistent with the City's design standards, additional considerations would be made for the safe conveyance and overland flow release of the 100-year storm event assuming a total blockage of the storm drain system. Prior to acceptance and issuance of construction documents, the final design for the storm drainage infrastructure and overland conveyance system would be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department to ensure it complies with the City Improvement Standards and the ARSP Drainage Master Plan. Consistency with City standards would avoid the potential for flooding within the project site.

The peak flows exiting the site under Post-Project conditions slightly exceed the Pre-Project peak flows for the 2-year and 10-year events. However, the Proposed Project would include numerous LID measures such as vegetated swales, porous pavement, and interceptor trees. Although these measures are primarily utilized to improve stormwater quality, in small storms such as the 2- and 10-year events, they would also function to slow the rate of runoff leaving the site. Therefore, the results presented in the DEIR are conservative "worst-case" scenarios for stormwater peak flows, as they do not include the reductions in peak flow due to LID measures. Additionally, as discussed above, the deliberate routing of water away from the Gleason property and Toad Hill Ranches is intended to remediate flooding outside of the 100-year floodplain, such as that which occurs in a 2- or 10-year storm event. In Pre-Project conditions, this water would eventually drain to University Creek downstream from the proposed location. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not change the overall amount of water in the system, although it would alter where it enters the creek. These small increases in peak flow from the 2- and 10-year events reflect the addition of flows that would normally negatively impact off-site properties to the north. The slight increases in peak flow in the 2- and 10-year storm events may result in impacts to off-site flooding or siltation, and this is a **potentially significant** impact. Mitigation Measure 4.13-5 requires the Applicant develop a plan to monitor for erosion attributable to the Proposed Project, and to implement measures to remediate and prevent erosion should it occur. After mitigation, the impacts due to the increases in 2- and 10-year peak flows are reduced to **less-than-significant** levels.

The hydraulic model predicts little difference between the Pre-Project and Post-Project [No Storage] conditions for the 100-year storm event (Kimley-Horn, 2016a; Appendix I). Further, as shown in the DEIR, the proposed drainage system would eliminate existing stormwater discharge points along the western site boundary that contribute to ongoing flooding issues caused in part by runoff on the ARSP site overtopping the existing ditch at Discharge Point G. No flooding would

occur on or offsite as a result of altered drainage patterns and increases in the rate of surface runoff. The proposed drainage pattern alterations have been designed to alleviate existing flooding issues both on- and off-site. However, the due to the rerouting of flows away from the western boundary and into University Creek, the 2- and 10-year storm events will have a slightly increased peak flow rate as compared to Pre-Project conditions, which is reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-5. There are no increases in peak flow from the 100-year storm event in the Post-Project condition, and therefore, impacts are **less than significant**. (DEIR 4.13-27)

Impact 4.13-5 (Increase in the Amount of Surface Runoff Volume, Which Would Exceed the Capacity of Existing Storm Drainage Systems and Increase the Potential for Downstream Flooding): Increased surface water runoff volume, when combined with the larger watersheds contributing to the Natomas Cross Canal watershed, has the potential to peak with the flood waters of the Sacramento River to cause downstream flooding.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 Fair Share Payment to Regional Stormwater Retention

The applicant shall annex into the fee district and pay the Pleasant Grove Drainage fee to the City prior to the approval of each building permit, which would cover the cost of retention for that development's portion of the Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Project at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Development of the Proposed Project would increase the impervious surfaces on approximately 481 acres of the project site, which would increase the volume of stormwater runoff into University Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek compared to existing conditions. In addition, development and grading would alter the existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities of the properties in the project site. This volume increase, when combined with the larger watersheds contributing to the Natomas Cross Canal watershed, has the potential to peak with the flood waters of the Sacramento River to cause flooding downstream of the project site in Sutter County. Development of the

ARSP is estimated to generate an additional runoff volume of 75.31 AF (Kimley-Horn, 2016a; Appendix I). The ARSP contribution to the increase in volume of runoff in the Natomas Cross Canal watershed would be **significant**.

The increase in volumetric flows from the project site would be managed to minimize the risk of downstream flooding beyond the boundaries in the Natomas Cross Canal watershed. The City of Roseville has approved a regional retention basin on City-owned property at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area. The Regional Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Facility will be located west of the project site. The EIR for the Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Facility was certified in 2003, and evaluated full buildout of the regional flood control project with a storage capacity of 2,350 AF. The flood control project evaluated two retention basins. Although not originally part of the fee

district contributing to the future construction of the flood control project, there is sufficient storage capacity within the design to allow the ARSP to annex into and participate in the fee program. Upon construction of the north basin within the Reason Farms Regional Retention Basin, there will be sufficient capacity for the ARSP stormwater flows. The City currently collects a drainage impact fee from new development projects to fund construction of the regional flood control project, which will be constructed as funds are made available. Following the approval of the Land Use Plan and annexation into the City, the ARSP will be annexed into the fee district area and will contribute their fair share towards the future development of the flood control project. The Proposed Project would require 75.31 AF of volumetric storage within the north retention basin, as detailed in Appendix I. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-3, which requires the project applicant annex into the Drainage Fee District and to pay drainage impacts fees for the volumetric storage needs of 75.31 AF, would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.13-34)

Impact 4.13-6 (Construction of Off-Site Stormwater Retention Facilities): The ARSP, in combination with buildout of other projects in the area, would trigger construction of the north retention basin of the Regional Flood Control Project at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-4 North Retention Basin Construction

All relevant construction-related mitigation measures for construction of the north retention basin within the Al Johnson Wildlife Area listed in the adopted Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program shall be implemented. The City shall monitor the discharge at the western boundary on a yearly basis, to ensure that there are no impacts and that the existing facility within the Al Johnson Wildlife Area is functioning properly.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Proposed Project would require 75.31 AF of volumetric storage within the north retention basin of the Regional Flood Control Project at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area. The ARSP, in combination with buildout of other projects in the area, would trigger construction of the north basin. The ARSP will contribute fees toward the construction of the Regional Flood Control Project. The potential impacts of construction of the north and south retention basins within the Al Johnson Wildlife Area were previously addressed in the EIR for the City of Roseville Retention Basin Project (SCH #2002072084) ("Retention Basin EIR"), incorporated by reference.

As concluded within the Retention Basin EIR, the majority of the impacts from construction and operation of the retention basins would be less than significant, or could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation identified in the Retention Basin EIR. However, the Retention Basin EIR determined that the following impacts may not be reduced to less-than-significant levels after application of recommended mitigation and would therefore remain significant:

- Conversion (direct and indirect) of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use
- Short-term (construction phase) impacts to air quality
- Short-term (construction phase) impacts due to noise
- Significant cumulative indirect growth inducement

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-4, North Retention Basin Construction, requires that all appropriate construction related mitigation measures identified in the Retention Basin Project Final EIR be implemented as part of constructing the retention basin to reduce construction related impacts. The ARSP would contribute toward the need to construct the north basin, and the ability to construct the basin is dependent on development fees, the timing of the construction of the basin is uncertain, and therefore would result in the significant impacts identified above; this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. As explained in Section 4, "Statement of Overriding Considerations", the environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh and override the remaining significant impacts related to the increase in the amount of surface water volume.

Impact 4.13-8 (Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts): Cumulative development in the Roseville area would contribute to increased peak stormwater runoff flows and increased elevations.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 Implementation of Construction Activity Stormwater Standards is set forth in full in Section 3.8.13 in relation to Impact 4.13-1.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 Stormwater Management Development Standards is set forth in full in Section 3.8.13 in relation to Impact 4.13-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 Fair Share Payment to Regional Stormwater Retention is set forth in full in Section 3.8.13 in relation to Impact 4.13-5.

Finding: *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*

Cumulative development in the Roseville area, which includes the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, would increase the amount of impervious surfaces which could contribute to increased peak stormwater runoff flows and increased flood elevations. This is a **significant** cumulative impact.

The City currently collects a drainage fee for the future construction of a regional stormwater retention basin at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area to mitigate for volumetric impacts. The Retention Basin EIR evaluated the potential environmental effects of construction and operation of the regional retention basin to mitigate volumetric concerns to downstream properties. The ARSP Drainage Master Plan (2016) analyzed the impacts to University Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek from buildout of the cumulative development in the region, including the ARSP, CSP, WRSP, and the Placer Ranch area, and assessed that against the pre- and post-project impacts of the ARSP.

The buildout of projects within the City of Roseville will be required to purchase credits within the City's retention basins to accommodate the volumetric flow increases modeled (Appendix I). With implementation of mitigation measures requiring in-lieu payments for the Al Johnson Wildlife Area, impacts due to cumulative development are reduced to **less than significant**.

All projects within the City are required to mitigate their peak flows to pre-project levels with the intent that there is no increase to the flood levels either upstream or downstream of the project. As described in the ARSP Drainage Master Plan (Appendix I), the post-development peak flows generated from the Proposed Project precede the peak flow timing of both the University Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek watersheds and, as such, there is no peak flow increase to flood levels as a result of the ARSP. Therefore, impacts due to cumulative development on peak flows are **less than significant**.

The Proposed Project and potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the project site, including growth resulting from build-out of the City's General Plan and the nearby specific plans, would be required to comply with the general NPDES permit of the SWRCB, which is intended to reduce the potential for cumulative impacts to water quality during construction. Cumulatively considerable projects that would discharge stormwater runoff would be required to comply with NPDES discharge permits from the CVRWQCB and would be subject to subsequent environmental review. Therefore, impacts associated with cumulative construction related water quality effects would be **less than significant**.

Each of the cumulative development projects and the Proposed Project would be subject to local, State, and federal regulations designed to minimize cumulative impacts to water quality from operation. Mitigation measures for the Proposed Project in combination with compliance with City, state, and federal regulations, are expected to reduce cumulatively considerable impacts to a **less-than-significant** level. (DEIR 4.13-8)

3.8.14. Aesthetics

Impact 4.14-1 (Alteration of the Visual Character of the Site and Vicinity): Introduction of residences, commercial uses, and infrastructure in an area that is presently undeveloped would change the existing visual character of the area.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact are identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Proposed Project would convert approximately 481 acres of the 694.4-acre project site into urban uses. Approximately 144 acres would remain as open space and 20 acres would remain as Urban Reserve. Conversion of the majority of the site to urban uses would represent a significant

and unavoidable impact for which there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because a majority of the grasslands on the site would be developed, the character of the drainage corridors would change from meandering rural streams to open space corridors in open space preserves within an urban landscape. The permanently designated open space area in the Proposed Project does provide open space linkages between the WRSP, CSP, and Al Johnson Wildlife Area. Underground utility distribution to the majority of the project site is proposed as a part of the Proposed Project; however, one overhead 60 kV electrical line extension is proposed along the east side of the proposed Westbrook Boulevard and south of proposed. Back-yard fences abutting the Sunset right-of-way would be screened by a 10-foot landscaped buffer and residential uses would be set back 20 feet from edge of property to reduce the visual impact experienced by travelers on West Sunset Boulevard and from the residential uses within the Toad Hill Ranches.

The City's General Plan Policies for Community Design serve to promote the visual compatibility of developments through the application of community design standards. Specifically, Policy 6 requires site and building designs that are in scale and compatible with adjacent development. In addition, the ARSP Design Guidelines include specific landscape buffer and screening requirements for utilities, loading areas, and mechanical units. Implementation of the General Plan Policies and the ARSP Design Guidelines would help reduce the significant impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels.

Nevertheless, mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. Thus, because it is impossible to allow new development without impacting scenic vistas, mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level is infeasible. The visual alteration of the project site would be **significant and unavoidable**. (DEIR p. 4.14-10)

Impact 4.14-2 (New Sources of Light and Glare): Development of the project site would create light from urban development such as residences and commercial uses, as well as recreational facilities, streetlights, and vehicles.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 Sight Lighting to Minimize Nuisance

Light producing uses, such as ball fields, within the project site shall be located and oriented to minimize visual impacts on adjacent residential areas. Lighting shall be shielded and designed to distribute light in the most effective and efficient manner, using the minimum amount of light to achieve the necessary illumination for the use. Light poles shall be designed using either 100 watt or LED light bulbs, and shall use the best technology that maximizes glare and spillage reduction.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 Low Glare Materials for New Development

In order to reduce the effects of daytime glare from development of commercial or office uses within the project site, building developers shall utilize, when feasible, low-glare materials.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spill Over into University Creek and Open Space Areas

Outdoor lighting shall be placed, designed, and directed so as to avoid light spillover into the habitat of University Creek, Open Space Preserve Areas, and the Al Johnson Wildlife Area. These parcels include those immediately adjacent to the open space and shown on the Land Use Map as parcels, AR-3, AR-4, AR-7, AR-8, AR-11, AR-20, AR-24, AR-37, AR-56, AR-57, AR-60, AR-63, and the Urban Reserve parcel AR-110.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

The project site is currently undeveloped and contains no light sources with the exception of light from the existing residential unit in the northeastern portion of the site. Development of the Proposed Project site would result in a substantial change in the amount of light generated on the project site and would alter nighttime views of the project site. There would be light from residences, businesses, recreational facilities, streetlights, and vehicles, all of which would increase the ambient nighttime illumination level.

In order to ensure impacts associated with exterior building lights, park lights, and street lights would be reduced, Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 requires siting of light-producing uses to minimize impacts on adjacent sensitive uses and shielding of light fixtures. Low-glare materials would be utilized for new buildings to reduce glare impacts as required by Mitigation Measure 4.14-2. To ensure lighting would not adversely affect wildlife in open space areas and along University Creek, Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 would reduce light impacts on nearby open space through design measures and light direction and placement. Further, the Roseville Parks and Recreation Department uses energy efficient low emitting diodes (LED) lights which produce less light spill over.

Daytime glare could result from commercial and office buildings associated with the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 would ensure that low-glare materials would be used for development of new large-scale buildings associated with the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 through 4.14-3, the City's Community Design Guidelines, and the ARSP Design Guidelines provide effective methods to reduce light and glare impacts. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with light and glare to a less-than-significant level while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. The overall change in the level of light and glare on the project site would remain **significant and unavoidable** because the area currently lacks light and glare sources and would still be visibly changed in the context of nighttime lighting and daytime glare. (DEIR 4.14-12)

Impact 4.14-3 (Degradation of Scenic Resources and Scenic Vistas): Implementation of the Proposed Project could impair views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains from within the project site.

Mitigation: In light of known economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, no feasible or potentially feasible measures to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level are identified in the EIR.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

There are no designated scenic roads, resources, or vistas within or adjacent to the project site. The project site is not a designated scenic area in the City or County General Plans. Long-range views include the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east, while short-range views include views of the adjacent residential areas within the City, rural residential housing to the north and undeveloped areas to the west. Development within this area would change scenic resources and scenic vistas.

The Proposed Project would result in large-scale development projects that could impair views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains from within the project site by placing buildings within view corridors. While views of the mountains to the east and the rural grasslands to the west are not designated scenic resources, they are a significant part of the visual landscape. The Proposed Project includes open space areas that provide view corridors from within the site, but views would still be obstructed by surrounding development. While these views are not designated scenic vistas, development of the Proposed Project would nonetheless change existing view corridors, which is considered a **significant** impact.

Mitigation to a less-than-significant level is not possible while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. However, all Proposed Project development would be required to comply with the City's Design Guidelines, General Plan policies, and ARSP Design Guidelines, all of which are intended to reduce aesthetic impacts. This impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**, even with compliance with these policies. (DEIR p. 4.14-14)

Impact 4.14-4 Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts: The Proposed Project would contribute to permanent alteration of visual character of the area.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 Sight Lighting to Minimize Nuisance is set forth in full in Section 3.8.14 in relation to Impact 4.14-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 Low Glare Materials for New Development is set forth in full in Section 3.8.14 in relation to Impact 4.14-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 Avoid Light Spill Over into University Creek and Open Space Areas is set forth in full in Section 3.8.14 in relation to Impact 4.14-2.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

Cumulative development in southwest Placer County has resulted in the conversion of a primarily rural landscape to urban development, thereby permanently altering the visual character of the area, both during daytime and at night. This trend is anticipated to continue, which could result in a significant cumulative aesthetics impact. In combination with existing, approved and proposed development in the project vicinity, including but not limited to the construction of Placer Parkway, buildout of the Creekview, West Roseville, and Sierra Vista Specific Plans within the City, the Placer Ranch area, and Sunset Industrial Area, a large area would be urbanized. The Proposed Project would have a **significant** contribution to the loss of open space and would introduce new sources of light and glare.

Although development in the City of Roseville would be required to meet the City's Community Design Guidelines, ensuring that proposed development would be visually compatible with surrounding development, it would nonetheless permanently and substantially alter the environment, causing a cumulative aesthetic impact. Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 through 4.14-3 provide effective methods to reduce light and glare impacts. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with light and glare to a less-than-significant level while still allowing for implementation of the specific plan. The project's contribution to this impact is considered cumulatively considerable. With the implementation of identified mitigation measures, the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

3.9. Energy

Impact 4.15-1 (Increased Consumption of Energy): The Proposed Project will result in the consumption of energy, natural gas, and transportation fuel.

Mitigation Measure 4.15-1 Implement Measures to Reduce Energy Consumption

Implementation of the Air Quality Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(d) and (f) and Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 reduce direct and indirect operational energy consumption. The requirements of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(d) and (f) and Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 are listed below:

MM 4.4-1 Measures to Reduce Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions

d. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or greater) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, shall achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction as required by CARB. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.

f. Include the following standard notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan:

- During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
- During construction the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.

MM 4.4-2 Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions

Following receipt of an application for a Tentative Maps (excluding the Large Lot Subdivision Map), Design Review Permit, conditional use permits and/or all discretionary permits, the applicant shall forward an early consultation notice to the PCAPCD. Where the PCAPCD provides comments on a specific development proposal, the applicant shall consult with PCAPCD and the developer to incorporate measures recommended by the PCAPCD and agreed to by the applicant into the Proposed Project. Where the PCAPCD does not provide comment on a specific development proposal, the applicant shall incorporate measures that reduce vehicle emissions and operation emissions from the proposed development. This measure shall be implemented through project design, conditions of approval, noticing and disclosure statements, or through the City's plan check and inspection processes. This process is intended to ensure that best available and practical approaches are used to reduce operational emissions in specific tentative map and design review permit applications. The following is a listing of measures that shall be implemented for the purpose of reducing vehicle and operational emissions, unless the applicant demonstrates to the City's satisfaction that the measure is infeasible. If the applicant demonstrates that any particular measure in the list below is infeasible for a proposed project to which it would otherwise be applicable, the applicant must provide an analysis demonstrating that a replacement measure is comparably effective.

- Provide tree plantings that meet or exceed the requirements of the City's Community Design Guidelines to provide shading of buildings and parking lots.
- Landscape with native drought-resistant plants (ground covers, shrubs, and trees) with particular consideration of plantings that are not reliant on gas-powered landscape maintenance equipment.
- Require all flat roofs on non-residential structures to have a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demand, unless a demonstration of infeasibility is made by the applicant.
- Provide conductive/inductive electric vehicle charging station and signage prohibiting parking for non-electric vehicles within designated spaces within non-residential developments.
- Provide vanpool parking only spaces and preferential parking for carpools, to accommodate both carpools and vanpools in employment areas (e.g. community commercial, business-professional uses).

- All truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208 volt power outlet for every two-dock doors. Signs shall be posted stating "Diesel trucks are prohibited from idling more than five minutes and trucks requiring auxiliary power shall connect to the 110/208-vot outlets to run auxiliary equipment."
- Design streets to maximize pedestrian/bicycle access to transit stops.
- Require site design to maximize access to transit lines, to accommodate bus travel, and to provide lighted shelters at transit access points.
- Develop the plan consistent with the higher residential densities (within approved residential density ranges of zone) provided around the village nodes and transit corridors.
- Participate in Roseville Electric incentive programs for energy-efficient development where feasible as available.
- Ten percent of the residential units shall be designated as low to very-low income residential units.
- A pedestrian and bicycle access network shall link areas of the project site with other land uses.
- Electric landscape maintenance equipment shall be utilized on parks and public/quasi-public lands.
- Design buildings to meet the 2013 Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards (which is a 25 percent reduction below 2010 Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards).
- Ensure that all public street and area lighting installed on the site shall be considered high efficiency lighting.
- Utilize reclaimed water where available for irrigation of all non-single family areas within the project site, including the school, parks, paseos, roadway landscaping, and commercial landscaping.
- Reduce the area of turf allowed consistent with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and the Water Conservation Strategy (see Appendix G). Install water efficient landscape irrigation systems at all public land uses.

Measures for Residential Units:

- Require electrical outlets be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of residences to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.
- Require every garage of each single family home to be considered "Electric Vehicle Ready." This by definition is not limited to, but includes a conduit raceway to a spare electric box in the garage that is sized for a future 220v outlet. A 220v breaker space must be available in the electrical panel.
- Require installation of a gas outlet in the rear of residential buildings for use of outdoor cooking appliances, such as gas burning barbeques.
- Require installation of low NO_x hot water heaters (beyond District Rule 246 requirements).

- Prior to approval of Tentative Maps: provide notice to homebuyers through conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) or other mechanisms to inform them that only gas fireplaces shall be permitted.
- The applicant shall ensure that builders offer only energy efficient appliances for installation in residential units, including Energy Star refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans.

Finding: *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

The Proposed Project will result in the consumption of energy, natural gas, and transportation fuel. This is a **potentially significant** impact. As discussed above, various proposed design features and mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure the more efficient use of energy resources during project operation. With mitigation, the Proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, this impact would be considered **less than significant**. (DEIR p. 4.15-11)

4. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In determining whether to approve a project, CEQA requires all public agencies to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental impacts. The City Council approves the Proposed Project despite the significant unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the EIR. The EIR consists of five text volumes and associated appendices: the Draft EIR and the Draft EIR technical appendices, the Final EIR text, and the Final EIR technical appendices.

The Final EIR identifies and discusses unavoidable significant effects that would occur as a result of implementing the ARSP, in addition to addressing comments received on the DEIR. With implementation of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted by the City to mitigate or avoid significant impacts on the environment, many of the environmental impacts of the project can be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The Final EIR determined that the project is expected to result in significant and unavoidable impacts as discussed in Section 3.8 above.

4.1. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the Proposed Project

The EIR identifies the following significant and unavoidable impacts for the Proposed Project in the following resource areas as identified in Section 3.4:

- Land Use and Agricultural Resources (Impacts 4.1-3 and 4.1-8)
- Population and Housing (Impact 4.2-4)
- Transportation and Circulation (Impacts 4.3-5, 4.3-6, 4.3-8, 4.3-9, 4.3-11, 4.3-12, 4.3-15, 4.3-17, and 4.3-20)
- Air Quality (Impacts 4.4-1, 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-5, 4.4-6, and 4.4-7)

- Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Impact 4.5-1)
- Noise (Impacts 4.6-1, 4.6-5, 4.6-7, and 4.6-9)
- Vegetation and Wildlife (Impact 4.8-18)
- Public Utilities – Water (Impacts 4.12.1-4 and 4.12.1-8)
- Public Utilities – Wastewater (Impacts 4.12.3-3 and 4.12.3-5)
- Public Utilities – Solid Waste (Impact 4.12.4-5)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Impact 4.13-6)
- Aesthetics (Impacts 4.14-1, 4.14-2, 4.14-3, 4.14-4)
- Energy (Impact 4.15-1)

4.2. Benefits of the Project

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City Council of the City of Roseville adopts and makes the following statement of overriding considerations regarding the remaining significant unavoidable impacts of the project, as discussed above, and the anticipated economic, social, and other benefits of the project.

The City Council finds and determines that (1) the majority of the significant impacts of the project will be reduced to acceptable levels by implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in these findings; (2) the City Council's approval of the project as proposed will result in certain significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures into the project; and (3) there are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level the remaining significant environmental impacts.

In light of the environmental, social, economic, and other considerations identified in the findings above, and the considerations set forth below related to this project, this City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the project's significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

The following statements identify the reasons why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts. The substantial evidence supporting the enumerated benefits of the project can be found in the preceding findings, which are herein incorporated by reference; in the project itself; and in the record of proceedings as defined above. Each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the project outweigh its significant adverse environmental effects and is an overriding consideration warranting approval.

4.2.1. General Plan Policies and Goals

The Proposed Project will further the City's goals and policies for residential land use, as set forth in its General Plan, by providing a variety of residential land use designations in an area designated

for growth in the City's plan to meet the future needs of the City and the region, while ensuring compatibility with planned land uses.

Specifically, the Proposed Project includes construction of 2,827 dwelling units in three residential land use classifications on 694 acres (DEIR p. 2-12). The three residential land use classifications proposed are LDR (0.5-6.9 du/ac), MDR (7.0-12.9 du/ac), and HDR (13.0-30 du/ac) (DEIR p. 2-13). The LDR neighborhoods will provide market-rate, distinctive, high-quality housing. The ARSP affordable housing program focuses on the HDR parcels within the project site. Of the total number of dwelling units, 10 percent are planned to meet affordability criteria for low- and very-low income households, as set forth in the City's General Plan Housing Element. Providing a mix of housing types promotes for all incomes promotes General Plan Land Use Element Policy 4 and Housing Element Policy 3.

The Proposed Project would expand recreational opportunities within the City by providing 167.7 acres of neighborhood parks and open space which represents 24 percent of the total project site. Planned park facilities include seven neighborhood parks throughout the project site and approximately 134.8 acres of open space. Within the open space area, approximately 98 acres would be designated as permanent on-site open space preserve. In addition, a system of pedestrian and bikeway paths is proposed providing off-street linkages throughout the community connecting to the City's existing and planned regional trail and bicycle network facilities. Two miles of open space paseos will augment and facilitate pedestrian and bicycle movement throughout the project site and de-emphasize the importance of automobile travel. This variety of benefits associated with the Proposed Project would promote General Plan Circulation Element Policy 1, Parks and Recreation Element Goal 2, and Open Space and Conservation Element Goal 4 and Policies 1, 2, 4 and 7.

4.2.2. Jobs/Housing and Economic Development

The Proposed Project would add a new variety of commercial land uses to the City. The Proposed Project includes 51.2 acres of land designated for commercial use, under the commercial classifications of Community Commercial and Community Commercial – Village District (DEIR p. 2-14). The development of commercial uses is anticipated to increase employment within the project site. Based on its approximately 476,000 square feet of new commercial retail and office uses, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,115 new jobs. In addition to creating long-term employment opportunities through commercial, office, and retail components of the project, development of ARSP would create hundreds of construction-related jobs, as well as jobs related to schools.

The creation and development of mix of land uses that provide linkages between jobs and employment uses is crucial to achieving a well-balanced ratio of jobs and housing identified in Land Use Element, Community Form – Jobs/Housing and Economic Development Policy 1. Given the proximity of employment opportunities and commercial services to residential areas, the

Proposed Project plays a role in achieving the desirable goals set forth in the policy. Overall the Proposed Project is anticipated to add more housing than jobs which will result in a slightly more balanced ratio. Over time, this could mean potential reduction in vehicle trips improves air quality, reduces GHG generation, and provides options for walking/biking to work.

4.2.3. Public Revenues

The Proposed Project is fiscally positive. It would increase tax revenues to the City through increased property values, an expanded housing market, and increased and expanded commercial activities and other job-generating uses, and the overall enhancement of the City's economic base. The Applicant would contribute its fair share toward the cost of transportation improvements outside of the project site (i.e., roads and bridges).

4.2.4. Preferred SACOG Blueprint Scenario

The eastern half of the project site is identified as an appropriate area to accommodate urban growth within the Preferred SACOG Blueprint Scenario. The Sacramento Region Blueprint identifies a way for the region to growth through the year 2050 generally consistent with seven principle of "smart growth." Promoting compact, mixed-use development and more transit choices as an alternative to low density development. The City has adopted its own strategies for implementing the Blueprint Plan, *Smart Choices, Implementation Strategies to Implement the Blueprint Project*. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Blueprint Plan's seven growth principles, as well as the City's nine implementation strategies, including connectivity among neighborhoods, commercial uses, schools and parks, and preservation of open space. The Proposed Project plays a strong role toward achieving the regional benefits identified in the Blueprint Plan.

4.3. Conclusion

Having reduced many of the effects of the Proposed Project by adopting all feasible mitigation measures, and balancing the benefits of the project against the project's significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the City Council hereby determines that the specific overriding social, environmental, and economic benefits of the project set forth above outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse effects of the project on the environment. The City Council finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth above constitutes a separate and independent basis for finding that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and warrants approval of the project.