



INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number

Life Time Fitness Center Project, 2012PL-103 (OA-000028, SPA-000048,

CUP-000080, DRP-000470)

Project Location

1435 East Roseville Parkway at the intersection with Secret Ravine Parkway,

Roseville, Placer County

Project Description

The Life Time Fitness Center Project encompasses approximately 17.4 acres in the City of Roseville. The proposed project includes development of a fitness center and associated parking and landscaping. Requested project entitlements include: (1) a Specific Plan Text Amendment to eliminate two parcel specific conditions; (2) a Zoning Text Amendment to add Outdoor Recreation as a conditionally permitted use in the Community Commercial zone; (3) a Conditional Use Permit to allow Outdoor Recreation uses; and (4) a Design Review Permit.

Project Applicant

Life Time Fitness Center, 2902 Corporate Place, Chanhassen, MN 55317

Property Owner

Tsakopoulos Investments LLC

Lead Agency Contact

Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner Phone: (916) 774-5276

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above described project application. The document relies on previous environmental documents and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures to which the project proponent has agreed in advance, the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared. Where the agency determines that some impacts may be significant while others will not be significant or can clearly be mitigated to less than significant levels through mitigation measures to which the project proponent has agreed, the agency may prepare an EIR focused on the potentially significant impacts.

In reviewing the site specific information provided for this project, the City of Roseville has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that at least one impact is considered to be potentially significant. Therefore, on the basis of the following initial evaluation, we find that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be required. Because many impacts will be less than significant or can be clearly mitigated to a less-than-significant level, however, the EIR will be focused on those impacts that are determined to be potentially significant. Based on the findings of the Initial Study impacts in the following issue areas will be further evaluated in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality

- Noise (project operation)
 - Transportation/Traffic

Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change

Prepared by:

Vayne Wiley, Associate Planner

Date:

1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Life Time Fitness project (proposed project) proposes to develop a 120,000 square foot (sf), two-story health and fitness facility with both indoor and outdoor amenities on a vacant 17.4 acre parcel located in the City of Roseville, approximately one mile from Interstate 80 at the northwest corner of Secret Ravine Parkway and East Roseville Parkway. The project site is located on Parcel 14 within the Stoneridge Specific Plan area.

According to the City of Roseville 2025 General Plan, the Stoneridge Specific Plan was adopted in March 1998 and includes 1,117 acres, a majority of which (699 acres) was previously designated as urban reserve in the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan, with the remainder (390 acres) annexed into the City from unincorporated Placer County. The Specific Plan includes 2,861 single and multi-family units, including approximately 35 acres of Commercial, 5 acres of Business Professional, 78 acres of Park, 270 acres of Open Space, a 15-acre school site and a fire station. At buildout, the plan area is expected to accommodate approximately 7,467 residents and provide 1,563 jobs. The specific plan area is nearing full buildout. As of December 2012, 2,263 residential units have been completed within the plan area (City of Roseville Quarterly Report).

The project site is currently undeveloped and designated for commercial uses (Community Commercial or CC) in the City's General Plan and in the Stoneridge Specific Plan, and is zoned Community Commercial (CC). Due to its location at the intersection of two major roadways, the project site was anticipated to be developed with a commercial use to support the surrounding development. Surrounding uses within the Stoneridge Specific Plan include the Stoneridge West – Village 1 (Stoneridge West) residential neighborhood to the east, and the Silver Ridge residential development and Saint Anna Greek Orthodox Church to the south. An existing 6-foot tall masonry wall separates the Stoneridge West development from the project site. City of Roseville open space and Miner's Ravine Trail are located to the southwest, across East Roseville Parkway. Further to the northwest along East Roseville Parkway are a fire station and a small commercial development. To the north, across Secret Ravine Parkway there is a 10.5-acre undeveloped parcel approved for an assisted living project and currently under construction; a 6.2 acre open space parcel is located further to the northwest. The Sutter Roseville Medical Complex and associated medical offices is located north of both of these parcels.

The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any waterways, streams or wetland areas. There are no trees on the project site. Small areas of bermed soil occur on the eastern portion of the site and there appears to be a detention basin located in the southwest portion of the site. The site is approximately 12 feet lower along the boundary of the site and is approximately 3 feet lower in elevation at the northeast corner of the site. The site is at grade with Secret Ravine Parkway and East Roseville Parkway. There is very little vegetation, as the site was graded in 1998/1999 and has been kept mowed since that time. Vegetation primarily consists of non-native grass and other non-native species.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATING ORDINANCES, GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

For projects, such as the proposed project, that are consistent with the development density established by the governing general plan for which an EIR was prepared, the CEQA Guidelines allow the use of previously adopted uniformly applied development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects of future projects, when the standards have been adopted by the City with findings, based on substantial evidence, that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the effects (§15183[f]). In April 2008, the City of Roseville adopted Findings of Fact related to the mitigating policies and standards, and adopted the City of Roseville CEQA implementing procedures for the preparation, processing, and review of environmental documents (Resolution 08-172). These findings are applicable to the following regulations and ordinances, which include standards and policies that are uniformly applied throughout the City, and will substantially mitigate specified environmental effects of future projects:

- Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch.14.20)
- Stormwater Quality Design Manual (Resolution 07-432)
- City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards (Resolution 07-137)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch. 9.24)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch. 4.44)

The City's mitigating ordinances, guidelines and standards are referenced, where applicable, in this Initial Study Checklist as well as information from the Stoneridge Specific Plan and City of Roseville 2025 General Plan. Because the City of Roseville has adopted CEQA Findings that these Mitigating Policies and Standards substantially mitigate environmental impacts, no additional project-specific mitigation is required for the specified impact areas. Under CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the impacts that can be substantially mitigated by these policies or standards are exempt from CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

In addition to the City of Roseville Mitigating Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards discussed above, the project would implement a variety of best management practices (BMPs) and other measures to avoid short- and long-term effects on the physical and human environment. These plans would be prepared before project activities are initiated, included in the contract specifications for contractors working on the proposed project, and implemented during project construction. The applicable measures are described below.

Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

Because the project would disturb more than an acre, the project contractor will be required to implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general permit administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (refer to http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/stormwtr/index.html for more information on the NPDES permit process). The SWPPP would identify structural and nonstructural BMPs to control erosion. The SWPPP will include spill prevention and control plan to ensure transport, storage, and handling of hazardous materials required for construction is conducted in a manner consistent with relevant regulations and guidelines.

In addition, the project will comply with the City's design/construction standards (refer to http://www.roseville.ca.us/pw/engineering/land_development/design_construction_standards.asp) and the City's Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction (2007). The project would also implement the applicable requirements of the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (PCFCWCD's) Stormwater Management Manual (Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District 1994).

Traffic Control Plan

The City would require the construction contractor to implement a traffic control plan, including a construction schedule and plan to meet the City's notice procedures, before construction activities are initiated. This plan would identify general methods by which construction activities will be managed to minimize substantial delays to traffic. These methods may include (but are not limited to):

- Appropriately sequencing activities (e.g., segment phasing, timing of grading, hours of construction) to minimize effects on traffic flow,
- Maintaining traffic flow in the project area to the extent possible, and
- Maintaining bicycle and pedestrian access.

Noise Control Measures

The following measures will be incorporated into the construction specifications for the proposed project to reduce and control noise generated by construction-related activities, consistent with City ordinances and standards (Chapter 9.24, Noise Regulation of the City's Municipal Code):

- Noise-generating construction activities will be restricted to Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., and Saturday and Sunday from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. to comply with the City of Roseville noise ordinance.
- All construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and all construction equipment shall be maintained in good working condition.
- Appropriate additional noise-reducing measures will be implemented, including (but not limited to) the
 following: stationary construction equipment will be located as far as possible from sensitive uses;
 sensitive uses will be identified on construction drawings; and equipment idling will be prohibited when
 the equipment is not in use.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The initial study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment.

I. Aesthetics

Would the project:

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

- a, b) The project site is located in the City of Roseville and is not adjacent to a State scenic highway, nor does the
 project include any trees, historic buildings or rock outcroppings that would be considered scenic resources.
 Because there are no city-designated scenic vistas or scenic resources on this site or nearby that the project
 could adversely affect, development of this site would result in no impact on these resources.
- c) The project site is zoned Community Commercial; therefore, it could potentially be developed with a variety of commercial uses that could affect the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Development of a vacant site would change its visual character; however, the surroundings are characterized by residential and commercial development and are included within a specific plan area that contemplated future development, so an appropriately designed project could be consistent with the surroundings.

The change in visual character and quality of the site could result in a potentially significant impact. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

d) The project is proposing to develop a new building, along with a parking lot and tennis courts that would all create new sources of light in the area which could also affect views in the area. The building lights and overhead light fixtures provided in the parking lot area and tennis courts are designed to focus light downward to prevent light spillover effects, also referred to as 'full cutoff lights'. Pedestrian sidewalks and landscaped areas would be lit using a combination of bollards and accent lights. This type of light standard provides minimal light and is designed to be low level. Because the project is introducing a significant amount of new light into an area that is currently undeveloped and does not contain any sources of light, this issue is considered potentially significant and will be further addressed in the EIR.

II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	•		·	х
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				х
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				х
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				х
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				х

a-e) The project site is undeveloped and located in an urban area of the City of Roseville within the Stoneridge Specific Plan. The site has been graded and kept mowed. The project site is designated and zoned for commercial uses and development of this area was contemplated in the Specific Plan and the City's General Plan since 1997. The project site is surrounded by existing development and contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or active agricultural operations. The most recent California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Maps for Placer County designates the site as Urban and Built Up land. This site has not been used for any type of agricultural activity for over 15 years and does not contain soils that meet the definition of Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No forest land exists on the site; therefore, the project would not involve the loss of any forest land. No agricultural operations exist in the project vicinity, and agriculture could not be conducted in an economical manner on the property, given its location and surrounding uses. The project would not involve any changes that could result in conversion of any farmland to a non-agricultural use or forestland to nonforest land use. Therefore, there would be no impact related to agricultural and forest resources.

III. Air Quality

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

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	x			•
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	x			
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	x			
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	х			
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

a) The proposed project site is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is designated nonattainment for both the federal and State ozone standards. Accordingly, the PCAPCD, along with other local air districts in the SVAB, is required to comply with and implement the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to demonstrate when and how the region can attain the federal ozone standards. As such, the PCAPCD, along with the other air districts in the region, prepared the Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Plan) in December 2008. The PCAPCD adopted the Plan on February 19, 2009. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) determined that the Plan meets Clean Air Act requirements and approved the Plan on March 26, 2009 as a revision to the SIP. Accordingly, the SIP and the Plan are the applicable federal air quality plans for the project site.

The Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the federal Clean Air Act requirements, including the National Ambient Air Quality standards (NAAQS). Adoption of all reasonably available control measures is required for attainment. Measures could include, but are not limited to the following: regional mobile incentive programs; urban forest development programs; and local regulatory measures for emission reductions related to architectural coating, automotive refinishing, natural gas production and processing, asphalt concrete, and various others.

A project would be considered to conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, regional air quality plans if the project would be inconsistent with the emissions inventories contained in the regional air quality plans and/or result in emissions that exceed the PCAPCD established thresholds of significance. Emission inventories are developed based on projected increases in population growth and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the region.

The project does not involve a change in the land use designation for the site, but does involve a modification in the anticipated use of the site as a commercial development. According to preliminary traffic data prepared by the City of Roseville, the proposed project's associated vehicle trips would be less than

what was estimated for the site based on the current allowed use of community commercial. It is estimated the proposed project would reduce daily vehicle trips and PM peak hour trips by over 50 percent and 40 percent, respectively, from what was estimated for the site based on the current allowed uses. Emissions inventories within the SIP were determined based on allowed uses; thus, the emissions related to the proposed project would be less than what was estimated and included in emissions inventories. It should be noted that construction-related emissions associated with the proposed project would be consistent with what was included in emissions inventories for the site, as the same assumptions for construction activities and area of disturbance would generally occur. Therefore, the project would result in a reduction of the anticipated emissions associated with the site and would not conflict with the emissions inventories of the SIP. In addition, the PCAPCD's permits, rules, and regulations are in compliance with the SIP and the Plan, and the proposed project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations associated with project construction and operation. General conformity requirements of the Plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. Therefore, it is assumed the project would not cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. However, because the final assessment of the traffic analysis has not been completed, there is the potential the project could conflict with the SIP or the Plan; therefore, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

b) As stated above, the project site is located within the boundaries of the PCAPCD's portion of the SVAB. The SVAB is designated nonattainment for both the federal and State ozone standards, for the federal 24-hour particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) standard, and the State particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) standard.

Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to increases of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrous (NO_X), PM_{10} , and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions in the area associated with project construction and operation. The project's short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions will be estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) software - a statewide model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify air quality emissions, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, from land use projects.

The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including the following, which shall be noted on City-approved construction plans:

- Rule 202 related to visible emissions;
- Rule 218 related to architectural coatings;
- Rule 228 related to fugitive dust; and
- Regulation 3 related to open burning.

Short-term emissions associated with project construction activity as well as operational emissions could result in potentially significant impacts. Therefore, air emissions associated with the project will be quantified and further evaluated in the EIR.

c) The SVAB is designated nonattainment for both the federal and State ozone standards. In order to improve air quality and attain the health-based standards, reductions in emissions are necessary within nonattainment areas. The project is part of a pattern of urbanization occurring in the greater Sacramento ozone nonattainment area. The growth and combined population, vehicle usage, and business activity within the nonattainment area from the project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the City of Roseville and Rocklin and surrounding areas, could either delay attainment of the standards or require the adoption of additional controls on existing and future air pollution sources to offset emission increases. Thus, the project could cumulatively contribute to regional air quality health effects through emissions of criteria and mobile source air pollutants. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be further addressed in the EIR.

- d) The proposed project includes the development of a new fitness facility on a currently vacant lot surrounded by existing development, including residences. There is the potential that construction and operation of the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to an increase in pollutants, as discussed above. This is considered a potentially significant impact that will be further addressed in the EIR.
- e) Typical odor sources include industrial or intensive agricultural uses. Diesel fumes from construction equipment and delivery trucks are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is considered short-term and temporary and diesel emissions would be minimal and regulated. The proposed project's commercial fitness center uses are not typically associated with the creation of objectionable odors. The project includes Life Café, an on-site bistro, which would produce food waste. Decomposition of biological materials, such as food waste and other trash, could create objectionable odors if not properly contained and handled. The project would provide adequate waste receptacles throughout the facility and would use outdoor trash dumpsters which would be picked up daily. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, nor would the project site be affected by any existing objectionable odors, and the impact would be less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Import
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Шраст	X	Impact	No Impact
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				х
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				х
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			x	

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				х
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				х

The project site has been previously graded in preparation for development and is within an existing urban environment. Vegetation on site consists of a ruderal assemblage of weedy species and is consistent with application of erosion control seed mixes that include clover (*Trifolium sp.*), and lupine (*Lupinus sp.*). A few native shrubs are growing near the retaining wall along the northeast boundary and include coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) and other common shrubs. There are no trees on-site. One large oak tree is located offsite just south of the project boundary and other larger ornamental trees are visible on off-site properties adjacent to the site to the east. A large stockpiled soil pile exists in the northeast-central portion of the project site. This soil is presumably left over from grading the site and excavation of a drainage basin in the southwest corner of the site. The drainage basin and a small swale along the southwest boundary of the site directs runoff from the site into the basin. It appears that these features were excavated as part of a previous development effort on the site. Both the swale and the basin contain sparse upland vegetation that is consistent with erosion control seed mixes used throughout the site. No waters of the U.S. or state occur on the project site.

a) Based on a site visit in March 2013 by a biologist and review of aerial photography and topographic data, the project site does not contain any habitat types that are suitable for any plant or wildlife species that are listed as threatened or endangered. Development of the site with a fitness center and associated amenities would result in no impact on any listed species or any species identified as a candidate for listing by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or by local plans, policies and regulations.

The shrubs on the project site, while not high quality nesting habitat and use for nesting is highly unlikely, could be used for nesting by raptors and migratory birds protected by the Fish and Game Code and federal regulations. The unconsolidated material in the soil stockpile on site could provide nesting habitat for burrowing owls. No active nests or evidence of occupied burrowing owl burrows were observed during the site visit. Burrowing owls are a California Species of Special Concern and both nesting raptors and burrowing owls are afforded protection under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. Although there are no trees on-site, there is one mature oak tree and a large ornamental tree immediately adjacent to the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. During project construction activities any nesting raptors could be disturbed; however, it is highly unlikely raptors would be nesting in these trees due to their location. The nesting season for raptors is generally between March 1 and August 31 each year. The disturbance of protected nesting birds would be considered a significant effect. Compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires that a pre-construction nesting raptor survey be conducted if construction is initiated during the nesting season, and requires that a non-disturbance buffer be established around any active nests that are discovered and that the buffer be maintained until the nest is determined to be inactive. If burrows with potential to support active burrowing owl nests are discovered during pre-construction nesting bird surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 further requires that additional surveys to determine if burrows are occupied be conducted according to CDFW protocol for this species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on nesting raptors or burrowing owl species.

- b) The project site does not support any riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. In addition, no riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities occur adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact any riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities.
 - It is unlikely the project site would be used for foraging due to its location and lack of adjacent tree cover. Undeveloped lands north of the site provide higher quality foraging habitat for raptors that may be in the area. The loss of this land for foraging habitat is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse effect on the availability of suitable foraging habitat in the area and is considered a less-than-significant impact.
- c) The project site is within developed uplands that lack any natural drainage features or characteristics of wetland resources. No wetlands occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site according to the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory data. Based on the site visit no features that meet criteria as waters of the U.S. or State were identified. The site and adjacent areas do not support any wetlands or other jurisdictional resources regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA); the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA and State Porter- Cologne Water Quality Control Act; and/or, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) pursuant to Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impacts to regulated waters, wetlands, or riparian areas.
- d) The site is within a developed urban area and provides no important wildlife cover and does not have habitat values important for it to be used as a wildlife movement corridor or nursery site. While wildlife may use the nearby off-site corridors associated with Secret Ravine and Miner's Ravine, and could occasionally move across the site, the site does not provide an important habitat link because it is separated from each of these corridors by busy roadways, is surrounded by urban development, and provides little vegetative cover. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e) Chapter 19.66 (Tree Preservation) of Article IV (Special Area and Special Use Requirements) of Title 19 (Zoning) in the Roseville Municipal Code includes regulations controlling the removal and preservation of trees within the City of Roseville. A Protected Tree is defined in the Roseville Municipal Code as a native oak tree equal to or greater than six inches diameter at breast height (DBH) measured as a total of a single trunk or multiple trunks. The project site supports a disturbed, ruderal community of grasses and weed species and there are no trees including any native oak trees greater than six inches in diameter on the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts on Protected Trees regulated under the Roseville Municipal Code, and as such, would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources.
- f) There are no conservation plans applicable to the project site. Therefore, there is no impact to conservation plans.

Mitigation Measures

If any active nests or burrows with the potential to support raptors or protected bird species as well as active burrowing owl nests are discovered during pre-construction nesting bird surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires coordination with the CDFW to ensure the proper buffer zones are established. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, any protected nesting birds would be identified prior to construction activities to ensure the species would be protected from harm during project construction; therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on nesting raptors and burrowing owl species.

Mitigation Measure Bio-1: If construction, grading or other project-related activities occur during the typical nesting season (March 1 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine if any raptors or protected native birds are nesting in or in the immediate vicinity of vegetation that will be removed. This survey shall also determine if any burrows with potential to be occupied or used by burrowing owls occur within the disturbance area. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March

through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found in the work area, a 250-foot buffer around the nest in which no work shall be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. City staff shall consult with the CDFW (and USFWS as appropriate) to confirm the approach. The no-work buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.

If burrows with potential to support burrowing owls are discovered, additional surveys shall be carried out to determine if burrowing owls are present on site. These surveys shall be carried out in accordance with Appendix D: Breeding and Non-breeding Season Surveys of the California Department of Fish and Game's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Staff Report) (available online at http://dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/ nongame/docs/BUOWStaffReport.pdf).

Monitoring of nest activity by a qualified biologist may be required if the project-related construction activity has potential to adversely affect the nest or nesting behavior of the bird. No project-related construction activity shall commence within the no-work buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the nest is no longer active.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

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

a-d) Based on information in the Stoneridge Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 97032058), nine historic sites, three prehistoric sites, and fifteen minor historical finds have been documented in the Plan Area. According to the Stoneridge Specific Plan EIR, no significant paleontological resources were discovered within the Plan Area. The EIR concluded that some of the identified cultural sites would be subject to disturbance with buildout of the Specific Plan. However, none of the sites subject to disturbance would be considered significant according to State or Federal standards, and all sites have been previously recorded.

Because grading activities associated with the proposed project would disturb the project site, the potential remains for subsurface archaeological features or deposits to be uncovered during construction. However, the City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208) requires that "[i]n the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are present on a project site, impacts to those resources would be prevented by the requirements of the City's Construction Standards. The Construction Standards require that the contractor stop construction if signs of an archaeological site are discovered during construction of the project. Work shall be halted, and the Community Development Department notified. A qualified archaeologist shall be notified, and additional mitigation may be required." The project would be constructed in compliance with the City's Construction Standards, which include measures specifically designed to protect cultural resources; therefore, potential impacts to any subsurface cultural resources are reduced to less than significant.

VI. Geology and Soils

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			Х	
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)			X	
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
	iv) Landslides?			X	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c)	is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			x	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			x	
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				х

- a) The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides.
 - i-iii) The project site is located in Placer County and according to the California Department of Mines and Geology the South Placer area is classified as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. Therefore, no impact would occur in association with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic related ground failure and these impacts are considered less than significant.
 - iv) Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. The project site is generally flat and does not contain any slopes steep enough to present a landslide hazard during construction or operation of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are considered less than significant.

- Grading activities would result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over covering of soils b) associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). The project site has been disturbed by previous grading activities and there are no notable topographic features on the site. Any grading activities would be limited to the project site and all grading and improvement plans would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department, Engineering Division, for consistency with the City's Improvement Standards. Grading activities would require a grading permit from the Engineering Division which requires including the provision of proper drainage, appropriate dust control and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures would be incorporated into the required grading plans. Additionally, project construction is subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards (section 11, Grading, page 10 and Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance), which requires preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would identify measures taken to prevent sedimentation and erosion during project construction. Compliance with the requirements of the City's Construction Standards, the federal NPDES requirements, and due to the limited amount of soil removal and exposure of soils anticipated, the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is considered less than significant. Moreover, as noted earlier, the City's Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance function as uniformly applied development standards within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines section 15183, so that potential impacts to topsoil from erosion are exempt from CEQA under section 15183.
- c, d) The City of Roseville 2025 General Plan does not identify the project site as being located in a sensitive geologic area that could expose people to potential geologic impacts. Additionally, the City's General Plan finds such impacts to be less than significant since new buildings and structures are required to comply with all applicable state and local building codes. The City's Public Works Department, Engineering Division, requires preparation of a geotechnical report to address suitability of the site to support buildings and to recommend measures to reduce risk of soil instability or ground failure. The City of Roseville Building Department would review construction plans before a building permit is issued and the Engineering Division would review and approve all rough grading plans to insure that all grading and proposed structures would withstand potential shrink-swell and earthquake activity in this area. Therefore, these impacts are considered less than significant.
- e) The proposed project would be required to connect to the City's sanitary sewer system. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impact to soils relative to supporting use of septic tanks would occur.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	x			

a, b) The project has the potential to contribute to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) through the use of construction equipment and trucks as well as through the increase in vehicles accessing the site. Short-term construction GHG emissions are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed project. Even under a worst-case scenario, where construction GHG emissions are amortized over the lifetime of the project and incorporated into the estimated annual operational GHG emissions, it is anticipated the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the

project would still be reduced by over 15 percent by the year 2020 as compared to business as usual. However, the project's contribution to GHGs are considered potentially significant and will be further addressed in the EIR. Such discussion will occur in the context of cumulative impacts, as the effects of GHG emissions are inherently cumulative in nature in light of the global character of climate change caused by GHG emissions.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With	Less Than Significant	No
	Environmental Issue	Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				х
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				x
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area?				x
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				х

- a, b) The proposed project would involve construction activities such as site preparation, grading and construction of the fitness center and associated amenities. These activities would involve the use of heavy equipment, which would contain fuels and oils, and various other products such as concrete, paints, and adhesives. During project operation, hazardous materials use would be limited to landscaping products such as fertilizer and pesticides as well as chlorine and other chemicals for the pool and whirlpool facilities. The City requires implementation of the following plans and special provisions to ensure the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment:
 - Compliance with the City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency) which requires contractors to transport and store materials in appropriate and approved containers along designated truck routes, maintain required clearances, and handle materials using fire department—approved protocols, as illustrated in Roseville Fire Code Ordinance 4594.
 - Implementation of a spill prevention and control plan (SPCP) to minimize the exposure of people and the environment to potentially hazardous materials. The SPCP would include measures to ensure the safe transport, storage, and handling of hazardous materials required for construction is conducted in a manner consistent with relevant state and local regulations and guidelines.
 - Compliance with the City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards and the City's Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction (2007) and implement the requirements of the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (PCFCWCD's) Stormwater Management Manual (Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District 1994).

In addition, the City of Roseville Fire Department is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Roseville. The Fire Department would review construction plans when finalized to ensure the proper safety and storage protocols, and procedures are in place in the event of an emergency. The Fire Department is available to respond to hazardous materials complaints or emergencies, if any, during construction.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and would not result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation and compliance with the City's plans, requirements, and special provisions described above would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

- c) The closest schools to the project site are the Stoneridge Elementary School and the Santa Anna Pre-School and Daycare. Stoneridge Elementary is located over a half mile south east of the site and the Santa Anna Preschool and Daycare is located adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. During construction activities, there is the possibility that potentially hazardous materials might be stored or used at the project site. The project contractor is required to comply with all California Health and Safety Codes and local City ordinances regulating the handling, storage and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials. The California Health and Safety Codes require a Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) for those uses that handle specified quantities of toxic and/or hazardous materials. Should an accidental release of hazardous materials occur during construction, the City (or City crews) and or the contractor, is required to notify the Fire Department's Hazardous Materials Coordinator who would then monitor conditions and recommend appropriate remediation measures. Potential construction related impacts would therefore be considered less than significant.
- d) A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Kleinfelder, October 31, 2012) was prepared for the site (included as Appendix A, available on the City's website http://www.roseville.ca.us/planning/edpn.asp and at the City's Permit Counter, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA during business hours, and will be appended to the Draft EIR). The report concludes that the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962. The report further concludes that the site is not listed as a hazardous substance or petroleum product generator and there were no records for the site revealed in the City of Roseville Fire Department records. Off-site facilities listed within the American Society for Testing and Materials search distance are not considered to have adversely affected the site, based on information provided in the Phase I Environmental Assessment. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- g) The proposed project is the development of a fitness center on a 17-acre site in the City of Roseville. The project does not include the development of new roads or uses that would interfere with the City's emergency response or evacuation plans. The project would be designed to facilitate emergency traffic through and around the site, in accordance with the City's Fire Department development standards. During construction, emergency routes would remain open and emergency response plans would not be affected. The impact would be less than significant.
- e, f, h) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or in the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip. Sutter Roseville Medical Center located north of the project site does include two helipads to transport critically injured patients. The flight paths for aircraft typically follow major roadways; therefore, it is assumed a majority of helicopter flights would be above I-80. However there is the potential for some helicopter traffic over the project site, but it is anticipated it would be infrequent and would not create any safety hazards for employees or people in the facility. The project site is in a developed urban area and not adjacent to any wildlands and would not expose employees of the facility to any wildland fires. Therefore, there are no impacts associated with these existing uses.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			Х	
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			х	
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			х	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				х
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				х
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			х	
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				х

a-f) The major watershed in the Stoneridge Specific Plan boundaries is the Dry Creek Watershed. The project site is located within this watershed and would discharge storm water runoff into Miner's Ravine where there is a regional detention basin facility built to mitigate the increase of peak design flows downstream at Dry Creek. With the regional detention basin currently in place at Miner's Ravine, the project would not be required to mitigate peak flows on-site. A will serve letter has been issued by the City of Roseville Public Works Engineering Department Dated November 16, 2012, stating that there are adequate connections to the City's public storm drain system stubbed to the project site to support the project.

For stormwater runoff, the project would develop a majority of the site with pervious uses (e.g., building, parking lot, etc.) leaving the landscaped areas and grassy swales as impervious surface area. The on-site storm drain system would convey all of the project drainage into four separate 18" storm drain stubs that have been extended on-site from the main storm drain lines in East Roseville Parkway and Secret Ravine Parkway. Collecting on-site surface stormwater runoff would be controlled by a series of "curb cuts", and drainage inlets. The majority of the parking areas and drive aisles' surface runoff would enter through strategically located curb cuts, and then discharge to grassy swales located throughout the site. Other areas would collect surface stormwater in drain inlets, which would then be piped and discharged to grassy swales. The swales would allow water to percolate into the soil providing water quality treatment and also decreasing flow duration times. The grassy swales would also contain drain inlets to collect the treated stormwater flows that would then be discharged into existing storm drain stubs. All stormwater would discharge into Miner's Ravine into the regional detention basin. Roof water from the building, and the outdoor pool area would enter a subsurface storm drain system located along the rear of the building where it would discharge to its own grassy swale, again providing water quality treatment. The tennis courts are designed to collect surface runoff in a similar fashion with drain inlets and trench drains placed outside of the court areas which would ultimately discharge to its own grassy swale. In-addition to grassy swales for water quality treatment, the project is proposing various site-based design strategies to collect storm flows including separated sidewalks, drought tolerant and storm water appropriate planting, and landscape interceptor trees. These storm water quality control measures have been designed to comply with the requirements of the City's Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development, the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, and Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions.

A grading permit, with associated mitigation measures for dust control (consistent with the City's Improvement Standards) would be required before construction begins. There may be minor amounts of wind and/or water erosion associated with construction of the facility; however, standard erosion control measures would be required during construction. Additionally, project construction is subject to the requirements of the NPDES, which requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, as discussed above under Geology and Soils. The SWPPP would identify measures taken to prevent sedimentation and erosion during project construction. Compliance with the requirements of the City's 2013

Design/Construction Standards, Section 11, Grading, and the federal NPDES requirements would ensure the project would not result in substantial erosion, flooding, or polluted runoff and the potential for water quality impacts is considered less than significant. Moreover, as noted earlier, the City's Construction Standards function as uniformly applied development standards within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines section 15183, so that potential water quality impacts are exempt from CEQA under section 15183.

No groundwater withdrawal is proposed. Over covering of the site with buildings and paving would have an effect on the absorption rate of water on-site; however, this is considered to be a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies because a majority of the site would not be developed with pervious surfaces.

- g-h) According to the City's 2025 General Plan Floodplain Map, the project is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain; therefore, no impact would occur.
- i) Folsom Dam is located approximately seven miles southeast of the project site. While portions of the City could be subject to flooding in the event of failure or damage of Folsom Dam, the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to dam failure inundation, according to the Placer County office of Emergency Services. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.
- j) Seiches and tsunamis are seismically induced large waves of water. Because there are no bodies of water nearby, the threat of seiche and tsunami is non- existent. Similarly, mudflows are not a concern in Placer County. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact relative to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

X. Land Use and Planning

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

- a) The project site is located at the edge of an existing developed area adjacent to two high volume roadways. Development of the site would not physically disrupt or divide an existing community because the site is currently undeveloped, as shown on Figures 2 and 3 in the attached NOP. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- b) The project site is designated Community Commercial in the Stoneridge Specific Plan and the City's General Plan and also zoned Community Commercial (CC), which allows an indoor fitness center by right (City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19 Zoning, Section 19.12.020 Permitted Use Types). The Stoneridge Specific Plan designates Parcel 14 to "serve as the primary neighborhood center with uses including a grocery/drug store and other neighborhood oriented uses." The project is consistent with the City's desire to provide other neighborhood oriented uses in this location. The project is requesting a text amendment to the Stoneridge Specific Plan to eliminate two parcel specific conditions, a text amendment to the zoning code to add Outdoor Recreation as a conditionally permitted use in the CC zone, and a Conditional Use Permit to allow outdoor recreation uses and a Design Review Permit. The City requires all

projects to comply with their Improvement Standards and Construction Standards in order to receive grading and building permits. Therefore, a safeguard is in place to ensure the project complies with the City's current regulations and requirements. In addition, the project has been designed consistent with the Stoneridge Specific Plan Design Guidelines.

The project has been designed consistent with all applicable City land use and planning documents adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect, as discussed throughout this IS. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

c) The project site is not located within the boundaries of a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan; therefore, the project would not conflict with any habitat plans and there would be no impact.

XI. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				x
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				x

a, b) The project site is designated Community Commercial (CC) in the City's General Plan and in the Stoneridge Specific Plan and consists of a vacant parcel. The site is not identified by the City as a site containing locally important mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources. The project does not propose to excavate the site for mineral resources; therefore, no impacts related to mineral resources would result from construction of the project.

XII. Noise

Would the project result in:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	x			
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			x	
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	х			

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	x			
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x

- a, c, d) Residents living near the proposed project site as well as neighboring uses may experience short-term increases in noise levels during construction. Noise levels during construction may exceed those levels deemed generally acceptable in the City General Plan Noise Element and noise ordinance; however the City's Noise Ordinance exempts construction noise that occurs during specified times (see prior discussion on page 3). In addition, project operation may also result in an increase in noise associated with outdoor activities including people playing tennis, pool activities, and children playing. The increase in ambient noise levels could exceed the City's acceptable noise thresholds. Therefore, due to the proximity of residences to the project site and the potential for noise to be a concern this issue is considered potentially significant and will be further addressed in the EIR.
- Project construction activities (e.g., earthwork) could expose persons to groundbourne vibration; however, these activities are temporary in nature and are not anticipated to result in any unusual or excessive vibration levels. No pile driving would be required to construct the building and groundbourne vibration would be limited to the City's permitted hours of project construction. The City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9, Health and Safety, 9.24 Noise Regulation) functions as uniformly applied development standards within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines section 15183, so that potential construction-related noise impacts are exempt from CEQA under section 15183. The Noise Ordinance exempts "private construction (e.g., construction, alteration or repair activities) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday; provided, however, that all construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and that all construction equipment shall be maintained in good working order (Ord. 3638 §1, 2001.)". Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would not permit noisy activities to occur during the nighttime hours or early morning when most people are home and could be disturbed. In addition, the potential for groundbourne vibration to occur is low because the type of equipment used and construction activities would not be creating the type of vibration that could be experienced by adjacent uses. Operation of the project does not include any uses or activities that would result in annoying levels of groundbourne vibration. Therefore, impacts associated with vibration would be considered less than significant.
- e, f)The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan area nor is it located within two miles of an airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The closest airport to the project site is a private airstrip, Holtsman Airport, in Rio Linda approximately 8.1 miles to the west. Therefore, no impact would occur relative to exposing people to excessive airport related noise levels.

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the project:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				х
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				х

a-c) The proposed project includes the development of a fitness center that would employ approximately 230 part-time and 75 full-time employees. Given high regional unemployment numbers in recent years, these positions should be filled by people who already reside in the region. The project is not large enough to induce substantial population growth resulting in the need to construct new homes and provide new services for this new population. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth because it proposes no significant employment generating uses, other than staffing required for the proposed fitness center. It would not indirectly induce population growth because it would not extend roads or infrastructure into previously undeveloped areas. In addition, the project would not displace people or housing because the site is undeveloped and does not provide housing. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact on population and housing in the City of Roseville.

XIV. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Fire protection?			X	
b)	Police protection?			Х	
c)	Schools?				Х
d)	Parks?				Х
e)	Other public facilities?			X	

a) Members and employees of the project may require the services of the Roseville Fire Department in the event of an emergency. The nearest fire station is the Ray Sharp Memorial Fire Station at 1430 East Roseville Parkway, located less than one-tenth of a mile from the southwest corner of the project site. The project has been designed in compliance with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes to ensure adequate water pressure and water is available in the event of a fire. The building also includes fire sprinklers in the event of a fire, per the Uniform Fire Code. The General Plan EIR has indicated that the policies of the General Plan are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts to fire services. Additionally, the developer would be required to pay a fire service construction tax that is used for purchasing capital facilities for the Fire Department. The project would not require an expansion of the existing fire station or the construction of a new one. For these reasons, the project would result in a less than significant impact on the City's fire protection services.

- b) Members and employees of the project may also require the services of the Roseville Police Department in the event of an emergency. The Roseville Police Department (RPD) is headquartered at 1501 Junction Boulevard, approximately 6 miles from the project site. The RPD has a force of 128 sworn officers and 77 non-sworn employees. The City has not adopted a police-to-population ratio, but strives to keep a ratio above 1.2 officers per 1,000 population. The Department is currently below the desired ratio. The current response time is approximately three to five minutes or less for an emergency call. The project would not require the expansion of the existing police department, or require the construction of a new facility. The General Plan EIR has indicated that the policies of the General Plan are adequate to mitigate any potential impacts to police services and the impact is less than significant.
- c, d) The proposed project does not include any residential uses; therefore, the project would not result in a population increase that would require new schools or parks to serve new city residents. Moreover, because the project would provide on-site recreational opportunities, the project would expand the range of potential recreational options in the area in which it is located, potentially reducing demand for the use of city parks that might otherwise deteriorate through time if overused. For these reasons, no impacts on schools and parks would result.
- e) The proposed project would not introduce a new population to the city needing access to public facilities or services. Therefore, no impact on other public facilities would occur.

XV. Recreation

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		X		

- a) The proposed project does not include a new population that would increase demand for existing park facilities. The project would provide another private recreational facility in the City, thereby potentially decreasing the use of other regional parks and recreational facilities by providing an additional option for project vicinity residents. The project would have no impact on existing neighborhood and regional parks.
- b) The proposed project would include the construction of new recreational facilities. The potential adverse physical effects on the environment associated with the construction of this facility are analyzed throughout this Initial Study. Construction and operation of the project could result in adverse impacts to air quality/climate change, noise, traffic and the aesthetics of the area. All of these issues will be further addressed in an EIR prepared for the project. The impact would be considered less than significant with mitigation.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	X	imaganon	impuot	mpast
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	x			
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				х
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				х
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			Х	
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			х	

- a, b) The project would generate an increase in vehicles accessing the project site as well as delivery trucks and project employees. A separate traffic study is being prepared to analyze potential changes in the performance of the circulation system and roadways that serve the area. At this time it is anticipated that the increase in vehicle trips could conflict with the City's level of service policy resulting in a potentially significant impact. These traffic issues will be further addressed in the EIR.
- c) The project consists of development of a fitness center in an area of the City of Roseville that is not within an airport land use plan. Due to the type of project it is, the project would not have the ability to change or affect air traffic patterns resulting in any potential safety risks. Therefore, there would be no impact on air traffic patterns.
- d) The project does not include the development of any public roads nor does the project include any design features that could increase hazards. The project includes internal driveways and parking lots that have been designed in compliance with the City's fire department standards as well as the City's traffic requirements for this type of project. Therefore, the project does not include any dangerous design features or incompatible uses that could result in hazardous conditions. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- e) The project has been designed in compliance with the City and the Fire Department standards to ensure emergency access meets current standards. Access to the project is proposed via the main entrance off of East Roseville Parkway with two entrances proposed off of Secret Ravine Parkway. The first entrance along Secret Ravine Parkway would be located approximately 200-feet east of East Roseville Parkway and would permit only right-turn ingress and egress into and out of the site. The second entrance would be located approximately 500-feet east of East Roseville Parkway and would permit right and left turn ingress and egress. The entrance off of East Roseville Parkway would also permit right and left turn ingress and egress into and out of the site. The internal driveways throughout the site have been designed to meet fire equipment turning radii and to ensure access in the event of an emergency. If the project is approved, the City and the Fire Department would review project plans prior to issuing a grading permit to ensure the project provides adequate emergency access. Thus, emergency access impacts are considered to be less than significant. Further, the nearest Fire Station is across the street from the proposed project, on Roseville Parkway, approximately one-tenth mile from the proposed project site.
- f) The project includes 643 parking spaces as well as bike racks. In addition, the project includes the relocation and redesign of a bus stop along Secret Ravine Parkway and includes new sidewalks along East Roseville Parkway. The project has been designed to encourage and support public transit as well as bicycle and pedestrian access to the site. The project would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs that address alternative transportation. Therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			x	
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			х	
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?			x	
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			Х	
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

a-e) The City of Roseville would provide sewer, water, and storm drain facilities to serve the project site. Sanitary sewer service is available from the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant located several miles southwest from the site. Wastewater would be conveyed from the project site to the treatment plant though existing sewer interceptors (Miner's Ravine Interceptor and the Dry Creek Interceptor), and trunk mains that include an existing twelve-inch sanitary sewer main in Secret Ravine Parkway (adjacent to the project site).

The project site is located within the Stoneridge Specific Plan and has been assumed for commercial development since the Specific Plan was adopted in 1998. The demand for potable water and wastewater treatment has been factored into the City's long range plans to provide these resources and services for planned development. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements and would not require the construction or expansion of existing water and wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the City has indicated that adequate water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity is available to serve the project as further described herein.

There are four existing eight-inch sanitary sewer lines currently stubbed on site. The project would connect into two of the sewer line stubs. The other two remaining sewer line stubs would be capped off for potential future points of connection.

Sanitary sewer generated by the project would flow via gravity to an existing eight-inch sewer line stubbed off of the existing driveway off of Secret Ravine Parkway. At this point of connection, the sewer line will begin as an eight-inch sewer line that would run parallel to Secret Ravine Parkway terminating approximately thirty-five feet from the property boundary. At this point it would become a private sanitary sewer system heading upstream along the rear of the site. The eight-inch private sanitary sewer line would terminate at the rear of the building (near the trash enclosure), and would be downsized to a six-inch sewer line continuing upstream to connect to the outdoor Bistro. One eight-inch sewer lateral would accommodate the building's wastewater demand along with two four-inch sewer laterals.

Sewer generated from the project would be treated by the City of Roseville at the City's Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP). The DCWWTP is a regional wastewater treatment facility that receives flows from the City as well as from other areas within Placer County. The current average dry weather flow (ADWF) of the DCWWTP is approximately 10 million gallons per day (mgd) of which 6 mgd comes from the City. The DCWWP is permitted to discharge up to 18 mgd ADWF. Using the City's wastewater generation rate (average dry weather flow) for commercial facilities of 850 gallons per day per acre, and applying that factor to the project site of 17.4 acres, the project is anticipated to generate 3,825 gpd or 0.015 mgd ADWF. The DCWWTP is currently sized to accommodate treatment flow from the proposed project.

Potable water to serve the project would be provided by the City. Folsom Lake has been the primary source of water for the City of Roseville since 1971. Through the Folsom Lake Municipal and Industrial (M&I) intake, Roseville receives untreated water from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). Additionally, through this same delivery point, the City receives a normal/wet year water supply from San Juan Water District (SJWD). City water supplies total 66,000 acrefee per year (AFY). Under the City's Water Forum Agreement, the City is only able to divert from the American River between 39,800 AFY during critically dry years up to 59,800 AFY in normal/wet years. The untreated surface water is delivered to the City's Barton Road Water Treatment Plant for treatment prior to delivery to City water service customers.

In addition to potable water supplies, the City utilizes recycled water supplies to meet a portion of the city's non-potable water demands. The city currently uses approximately 1,709 acre-feet per year (AFY) of recycled water for irrigation and industrial customers within the City of Roseville. Recycled water supplies are expected to increase to 4,462 AFY at build out. The use of recycled water as an assured source of supply reduces the total surface water supply need of the City.

Using the City's demand factor of 2,598 gpd/acre and assuming development of the entire 17.4 acre site the project would generate a water demand of 45,205 gpd or 50.64 AFY. Detailed information on the City's

water supply and water demands are documented in the City's most recent Water Supply Assessment prepared for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Westbrook Amendment, dated March 2012 (WSA http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/ filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=23269). As documented in the Sierra Vista WSA, City water demands at build out are expected to reach 63,316 AFY, which includes the water demands from this project. When considering build out, recycled water supplies of 4,462 AFY surface water supply needs total 58,854 AFY (63,316 AFY – 4,462 AFY). Existing water supplies are sufficient to serve this project in normal/wet and in dry and critically dry years. A letter has been issued by the City of Roseville dated November 7, 2012, indicating that the City has adequate water and wastewater capacities available to serve the proposed project.

The project would install an on-site public "looped" twelve inch water main to serve on-site domestic and fire safety water demands, per the City's requirements. The public "looped" water main points of connection would come from an existing twelve-inch water line extended on-site from East Roseville Parkway, and from a twelve-inch line stubbed off of Secret Ravine Parkway. The main water line in East Roseville Parkway consists of a sixteen-inch water transmission pipe with a twenty-four inch transmission line in Secret Ravine Parkway.

In-addition to the proposed twelve-inch public "looped" water main, the project would also install a private on-site water system. This would consist of a twelve-inch water main that loops around the building and pool area to serve fire hydrants, a six-inch fire line for the buildings sprinkler system, a four-inch line to provide domestic water to the building and an inch and half water line to serve the outdoor bistro. The final decision of all on-site pipe sizing would be made by the City of Roseville.

The project site is located within the Dry Creek Watershed. The project would discharge storm water runoff into Miner's Ravine into a regional detention basin facility built to mitigate the increase of peak design flows downstream at Dry Creek. The City has determined that the project site would not be required to mitigate peak storm water flows on-site. These storm water quality control measures have been designed to comply with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Quality Design. As noted earlier, the City's Construction Standards function as uniformly applied development standards within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines section 15183, so that potential water quality impacts associated with stormwater runoff are exempt from CEQA under section 15183.

For stormwater runoff, the project would develop a majority of the site with impervious uses (e.g., building, parking lot, etc.) leaving landscaped areas and grassy swales as pervious surface area. Collecting on-site surface stormwater runoff would be controlled by a series of "curb cuts", and drainage inlets. The majority of the parking areas and drive aisles' surface runoff would enter through strategically located curb cuts, and then discharge to grassy swales located throughout the site. Other areas would collect surface stormwater in drain inlets, which would then be piped and discharged to grassy swales. The swales would provide water quality treatment and also decrease flow duration times. The grassy swales would contain drain inlets to collect the treated stormwater flows that would then be discharged to existing storm drain stubs. Roof water from the building, and the outdoor pool area would enter a subsurface storm drain system located along the rear of the building where it would discharge to its own grassy swale, again providing water quality treatment. The tennis courts are designed to collect surface runoff in similar fashion with drain inlets and trench drains placed outside of the court areas which would ultimately discharge to its own grassy swale.

In-addition to grassy swales for water quality treatment, the project is proposing various site-based design strategies to collect storm flows including:

- Separated sidewalks
- Drought tolerant and storm water appropriate planting
- Landscape interceptor trees

These storm water quality control measures have been designed to comply with the requirements of the City's Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development. The City has indicated that adequate water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity is available to serve the project. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact.

The Western Placer Waste Management Authority is the regional agency handling recycling and waste disposal for Roseville and surrounding areas. Their facilities include a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL). Currently, the WRSL is permitted to accept up to 1,900 tons of refuse per day, and the average tonnage received is approximately 889 tons per day over a 7-day period. . As specified in the City's design/construction standards for solid waste (section 151), the City will ensure that its contractor meets with the designated Roseville Environmental Utilities inspector prior to beginning work to ensure that an approved plan is in place to store and dispose of all construction debris, according to relevant federal, state, and local statutes. During project operation the project would generate solid waste that would be disposed of at the WRSL. The WRSL has a total capacity of 36,350,000 cubic yards. As of July 1, 2009, a total of 10,911,366 cubic yards have been disposed at the landfill, leaving a remaining capacity of 25,438,634 cubic yards. Under current projected development conditions, the landfill has a projected lifespan extending through 2041. The project also employs an on-site recycling program to recycle construction debris as well as project waste. All solid waste from the City goes to the MRF for sorting of recyclable materials so that further aids in removing solid waste from going to the landfill. The amount of solid waste generated by the project is not anticipated to exceed the WRSL's current permitted daily amount. Therefore, solid waste impacts are considered to be less than significant.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	X			
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	x			

a) The proposed project consists of urban development in an area that contains no special-status habitat or seasonal wetlands or creeks, as discussed above in the section on Biological Resources. Nor does the site contain any known historic resources or prehistoric resources, as discussed above in the section on Cultural Resources. Compliance with the City's required mitigation for the unearthing of any unknown prehistoric or historic resources is identified in this Initial Study. Compliance with the required mitigation would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

- b) The proposed project may result in cumulative impacts to air quality, greenhouse gases, noise and traffic and transportation. These impacts may be cumulatively considerable and potentially affect the general public and the environment. Therefore, the cumulative effects of the proposed project may be considered potentially significant and would require further analysis in the EIR.
- c) The proposed project would generate an increase in air emissions associated with project construction and operation that may directly or indirectly have an adverse effect on residents living in the area. This is considered potentially significant and will be further addressed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

In reviewing the site-specific information provided for this project, the City of Roseville has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that at least one impact is considered to be significant. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation**, we find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **Environmental Impact Report** will be required to evaluate the following impacts:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change
- Noise (project operation)
- Transportation/Traffic

REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2008. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Placer County Important Farmland. Accessed March 7, 2013, available at ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/pla08.pdf.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Accessed March 13, 2013, available at http://dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/docs/BUOWStaffReport.pdf.
- City of Roseville. 1996. City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance. Last updated December 1, 2010.
- City of Roseville. 1998. Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines. March 18.
- City of Roseville. 2003. City of Roseville Mitigating Policies and Standards Findings of Fact. Adopted March 2008 (Resolution 08-172).
- City of Roseville. 2008. Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Annexation, Sphere of Influence Amendment, and General Plan Amendment Project NOP and Initial Study. March 28.
- City of Roseville. 2012. City of Roseville General Plan 2025. Last updated September, 2012.
- City of Roseville. 2011a. Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. January. Accessed March 13, 2013, available at http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=19079
- City of Roseville. 2011b. Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction. February. Accessed March 13, 2013, available at http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10580.
- City of Roseville. 2013. City of Roseville Municipal Code. Last amended in February 2013.
- City of Roseville. 2010. Creekview Specific Plan Draft EIR. December 2010.
- EIP Associates for the City of Roseville. 1997. Stoneridge Specific Plan EIR.
- FCA Construction. 2013. Community Entry Monument Sign. February 27, 2013.
- Fuhrman Leamy Land Group. 2013. Preliminary Landscape Plan. February 7, 2013.
- ICF International for the City of Roseville. 2012. Longmeadow Park Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. November.
- Kleinfelder. 2012. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. October 31, 2012.
- Life Time Fitness. 2013. Site Plan. February 28, 2013.
- MacKay & Somps. 2013a. Conceptual Stormwater Quantity Plan. February 8, 2013.
- MacKay & Somps. 2013b. Conceptual Utility Plan. February 8, 2013.
- Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. 1994. Stormwater Management Manual. Accessed March 13, 2013, available at: http://www.placer.ca.gov/~/media/dpw/flood%20control/documents/Swmm2004.ashx.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK