

INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number: Old Auburn Ranch, 2005PL-091

Project Location: 3170 Old Auburn Road, Roseville, Placer County

Project Description: The applicant requests approval of the following: 1) a General Plan Amendment to change 6.85 acres from Low Density Residential (1.8 units/acre) to Low Density Residential (4.8 units/acre) and 7.15 acres of Low Density Residential (1.8 units/acre) to Open Space/Floodplain; 2) a Rezone of 6.85 acres from Single Family Residential (R1) to Small Lot Residential (RS) and 7.15 acres from R1 to Floodway (FW); 3) a Tentative Map to subdivide 6.85 acres into 32 single-family lots and create a 12.35 acre open space parcel (Lot A) ; and 4) a Tree Permit to remove up to 11 protected oak trees along Spahn Ranch Road.

Project Applicant: City of Roseville, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville CA 95678

Property Owner: City of Roseville, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville CA 95678

Lead Agency Contact Person: Gina LaTorra, 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. With respect to this project, this document provides an analysis of the applicability of Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 (contained within CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because the project is consistent with existing zoning and the City's General Plan, for which Environmental Impact Reports were prepared. If a project meets the criteria of these Sections, as explained in more detail below, only those environmental effects that are peculiar or site specific to the project must be analyzed, as the broader environmental issues have been previously discussed in the earlier environmental impact report(s). Upon analysis, should the agency find no substantial evidence that the impacts peculiar to the project may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If it is determined that this project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that with specific recommended mitigation measures, these impacts will be reduced to less than significant, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment and such effect(s) were not discussed in the prior environmental impact report, or new information reveals that the effects are greater than described in the prior EIR, the lead agency is required to prepare an environmental impact report for the project. In reviewing the site specific information provided for the proposed project, the City of Roseville Planning Department has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has been prepared pursuant to the provision of CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

Prepared by: _____
Gina LaTorra, Associate Planner

Date: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes several entitlements that would allow for future development of 6.85 acres of the site with single-family residential units. The applicant request approval of a 1) General Plan Amendment to change 6.85 acres from Low Density Residential (1.8 units/acre) to Low Density Residential (4.8 units/acre) and 7.15 acres of Low Density Residential (1.8 units/acre) to Open Space/Floodplain; 2) Rezone of 6.85 acres from Single Family Residential (R1) to Small Lot Residential (RS) and 7.15 acres from R1 to Floodway (FW); 3) Tentative Map to subdivide 6.85 acres into 32 single-family lots and create a 12.35 acre open space Lot A ; and 4) a Tree Permit to remove up to 11 protected oak trees along Spahn Ranch Road. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would essentially restrict development to the west side of Linda Creek and preserve an additional 7.15 acres in Open Space/Floodway. The General Plan Amendment would allow 32 units where 25 are currently allowed. Construction of the single-family units is not proposed at this time and would require additional permits (see mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study discussion).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located at 3170 Old Auburn Road, which is at the intersection of South Cirby Road (which becomes Old Auburn Road) and Old Auburn Road. The site is within the Infill planning area. The parcel is bordered by Placer County to the east and south (see Figure 1). The adjacent parcels to the north and west of the project site are developed with single-family residential developments. Spahn Ranch Road borders the property to the west and is partially maintained by Placer County. The Placer County parcels fronting on Spahn Ranch Road are developed with single-family homes.

The ±19.2 acre site is currently a single parcel that is divided by Linda Creek. The site is undeveloped and primarily consists of undulating grassland habitat. A portion of the site to the northeast was previously disturbed and used as a stockpile for gravel, aggregate baserock and off-site soil. Protected oak trees are located on the parcel, primarily along Linda Creek. Dense riparian habitat can also be found along Linda Creek. Four potential seasonal wetlands and four drainage canals have also been identified on site.



Figure 1: Site Aerial

The site is owned by City of Roseville and was purchased to facilitate the re-alignment of South Cirby/Old Auburn Road. Roadway improvements have been completed.

The Roseville General Plan currently identifies 6.1 acres to the west of Linda Creek and 7.9 acres to the east of Linda Creek for Low Density Residential. The remaining 5.2 acres are identified as Open Space/Floodplain and include Linda Creek and surrounding bank. With this land use designation the site has a potential of 25 dwelling units. The General Plan EIR previously accounted for these units and evaluated the cumulative air quality, land use, jobs/housing, traffic, biological, cultural, risk of upset, open space, public services and utilities, and water impacts.

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The City has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for significant or potentially significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the General Plan EIR, West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) EIR, Capital Improvement Program (CIP) EIR and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan EIR, WRSP EIR, CIP EIR and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental

review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier program EIR. A program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

Regarding the subject project, the **General Plan EIR** serves as the program-level EIR from which incorporation by reference can occur.

1. General Plan EIR

The City’s 2020 General Plan was adopted on February 4, 2004 by Resolution #04-39. The current General Plan contains in large part the same goals, policies, and implementation measures as the previous 2010 General Plan (adopted on November 18, 1992, by Resolution #92-321), for which a formal General Plan EIR was prepared. However, the current General Plan has been updated to reflect the current level of development in the City and to reflect the 3,100-acre West Roseville Specific Plan annexation that was approved in 2004. Changes between the 2010 General Plan and the current 2020 General Plan were analyzed as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (WRSP EIR) (SCH #2002082057).

Each element of the General Plan (GP) references and provides policies relating to specific plans. The specific plans are viewed as the primary mechanism for implementing the goals and policies of the GP. The plans are consistent with, and incorporated by reference into, the Land Use Element of the GP (page II-59 of the GP). Specific plan land uses are reflected on the GP land use map. The specific plans establish detailed policies and implementation programs for portions of the City, consistent with the goals and policies established in the GP.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when they certified the GP EIR, identifying the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- flood hazard
- vehicular air emissions (ozone)
- construction air emissions (ozone)
- vehicle noise
- railroad noise
- noise from fixed sources
- conversion of open space outside of infill area
- jobs/housing imbalance
- affordable housing
- increased traffic/degraded LOS
- loss of annual grasslands
- loss of oak trees and oak woodlands
- loss of riparian woodlands
- loss of vernal pools
- loss of intermittent drainages and other seasonal wetland habitat
- habitat fragmentation and loss of wildlife habitat
- risk of hazardous materials-related emergencies due to rail operations
- cumulative air quality, land use, jobs/housing, traffic, biological, cultural, risk of upset, open space, public services and utilities, and water impacts
- growth inducement

2. WEST ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN

The West Roseville Specific Plan is referenced and utilized in the evaluation of this project as it represents the most recent significant change in land use and allocation of new land use to the City following the adoption of the 1992 General Plan. The project added approximately 3,100 acres to the City's corporate limits, and included a mixed-use land use plan of commercial, business professional, industrial, park, open space, and school land uses, and included 8,430 new residential dwelling units. As mentioned above, processing of this plan also resulted in an update to the City's 2010 General Plan.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it was determined that the West Roseville Specific Plan had the potential to have a significant adverse impact upon the environment, and the WRSP EIR (SCH #2002082057) was prepared for the project. A Notice of Completion was filed with the State of California Office of Planning and Research. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was certified by the City Council on February 4, 2004. A copy of the WRSP EIR is available for review within the Planning Department at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when they certified the WRSP EIR. The EIR identified the following impacts associated with development of the WRSP area as significant and unavoidable:

- Potential incompatibility of internal land uses
- Conversion of agricultural land to developed uses
- Inducement of substantial population growth
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on State Highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM10 from grading and trenching activities (short term)
- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term)
- Increased emissions of air pollutants during operation
- Loss of oak trees of greater than 6 inches dbh (short-term)
- Removal of historically significant properties and/or loss of historic integrity of such resources
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the landfill
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the MRF
- Construction debris demand for solid waste services
- Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity
- New sources of light and glare

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

- Agricultural land conversion
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways with Kaiser Medical Center
- Air quality emissions from construction
- Air quality emissions from operation
- On-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Off-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Loss of historic resources
- Increased demand for water
- Increased demand for recycled water distribution system
- Increased generation of solid waste
- Increased stormwater runoff in the Curry Creek Watershed
- Change in visual character

3. SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ROSEVILLE 2020 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM UPDATE

The Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and Roseville 2020 Transportation System Capital Improvements Program Update (2020 CIP EIR) was adopted by the Roseville City Council on June 20, 2007 by Resolution #07-311. The 2020 CIP EIR updated the City's Roadway Capitol Improvement Program (CIP) and General Plan to reflect changing conditions and ensure an adequate transportation system, consistent with the City's General Plan. The 2020 CIP EIR reflects the most current level of development in the City, including the 3,100-acre West Roseville Specific Plan annexation that was approved in 2004.

The EIR identified the following impacts associated with the General Plan land use allocation as significant and unavoidable:

Existing Plus Project Conditions

- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on state highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadways
- Growth-inducing impacts

2020 Plus Project Conditions

- Increased traffic on City of Roseville's roadways
- Increased traffic on state highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Growth-inducing impacts

2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on state highways
- Increased air emissions
- Loss of biological resources
- Growth-inducing impacts

CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITGATING POLICIES AND STANDARDS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines¹ allow the use of previously adopted 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 March 2003, the City of Roseville adopted findings 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.

- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)

¹ California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387.

- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- City of Roseville Grading Ordinance (RMC Ch.16.20)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Specific Plan Design Guidelines:
 - Development Guidelines Del Webb Specific Plan (Resolution 96-330)
 - Landscape Design Guidelines for North Central Roseville Specific Plan (Resolution 90-170)
 - North Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 00-432)
 - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (Olympus Pointe) Signage Guidelines (Resolution 89-42)
 - North Roseville Area Design Guidelines (Resolution 92-226)
 - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 87-31)
 - Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 88-51)
 - Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 98-53)
 - West Roseville Specific Plan (Resolution #04-38)

CLIMATE CHANGE

Background

Global climate change is a change in the average weather of the earth, which can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. It is exacerbated by greenhouse gases, which trap heat in the atmosphere (thus the “greenhouse” effect). Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, and are emitted by natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature, and is natural and desirable, as without it the Earth’s surface would be about 61 degrees cooler.²

Scientific evidence suggests that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle emissions, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere, and are increasing the rate and magnitude of climate change to a degree that could present hazardous conditions. Potential adverse effects of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels, changes to ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.³

The potential for climate change impacts at specific locations remains uncertain, and to assign specific impacts to the project site would be speculative. Some conclusions can be drawn about the potential in general for the project area to be subject to increased likelihood of flooding, drought, and susceptibility to the increased potential for infectious diseases as cited above. An individual project, even a very large project, does not in itself generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative process. A project contributes to this potential impact through its cumulative incremental contribution combined with the emissions of all other sources of greenhouse gases.

Legislation

In 2006, the State Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 32, which acknowledged global climate change and charged the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with developing regulations to address global climate change. CARB is mandated to achieve feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to approve an implementation plan no later than January 1, 2009.

There are currently no established thresholds for measuring the significance of a project’s cumulative contribution to global climate change. However, individual projects can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions by incorporating features that reduce vehicle emissions, and maximize energy-efficiency. The City has existing programs in place that reduce and minimize greenhouse gas emissions:

² “Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents, Comment Draft”. March 5, 2007.

³ Division 25.5 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Part 1. General Provisions. Section 38501 (a).

- City Adopted National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (2006)
- Joined California Climate Action Registry (2006)
- City adopted “Smart Choices for Roseville’s Future: Implementation Strategies to Achieve Blueprint Project Objectives (June 2005)
- City has installed solar electric generation (PV) on several City Facilities.
- City’s Civic Center and Roseville Electric buildings with clean, renewable power by purchasing 100% of their energy use from Green Roseville.
- 20% renewable power resources in Roseville Electric’s power portfolio.
- Shade Tree Program
- Roseville Electric goal to reduce energy requirements by 5% by 2012
- Alternatively Fueled City Vehicles
- Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
- City Traffic Signal Head Retrofit from traditional incandescent to LED
- City facilities retrofitted with a HVAC efficiency management program
- Solar Electric (PV) Incentive Programs
- Asphalt Recycling
- Residential Energy Efficiency Programs
- Energy Efficiency Programs for Low Income Residents
- Commercial Energy Efficiency Programs
- Tree Mitigation Ordinance
- Parking Lot Shade Tree Ordinance
- Recycling Drop-Offs throughout City
- Summer Youth Bus Pass
- Bicycle Incentive Programs
- ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) for traffic management
- Alternatives to Paper at the Library

Since there are no thresholds of significance against which to measure the impacts of the project, the project has been evaluated qualitatively relative to its incremental contribution to the overall issue of global warming. The magnitude of global warming is such that the contributions of the proposed project itself are negligible. It is acknowledged that the project would include sources of greenhouse gas emissions; however, the project also includes mitigating features that are beneficial in terms of minimizing greenhouse gas emissions.

As demonstrated in the checklist discussions below and the discussion that follows, no project changes resulting in important revisions to the previous EIRs, substantial changes in circumstances or substantially important new information (CEQA Guidelines thresholds per Sections 15162 and 15163) have occurred or become available in any environmental issue area since the time the CIP EIR, GP EIR, and WRSP EIR were certified.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact”

answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
5. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the impact does not require mitigation or result in a substantial or potentially substantial change of any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.
6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).
7. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

Initial Study Checklist

1. 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?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project site does not abut and is not visible from any scenic vista or scenic highway. The project will convert 6.85 acres of a vacant parcel to urban development and will preserve an additional 7.15 acres previously designated for urban development in open space. The project site is located within the City limits and residential land use was designated for the site in the General Plan. The General Plan EIR identified that the loss of annual grasslands to

urban development was an unavoidable significant impact for which the City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations.

The General Plan EIR assumed the site would be developed with 25 single-family homes and with the project, will now be developed with seven additional single-family homes. The potential aesthetic impacts from the increase in units are off-set by the increase in area preserved in open space and the decrease in the area to be developed. The potential aesthetic impacts associated with the incremental difference in units is therefore less than significant. The project is consistent with and will not result in any new aesthetic impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR.

The Planning Commission will review the Tentative Map for conformance with City standards including the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance. This discretionary review will reduce any potential aesthetic impacts associated with the project to a less than significant level.

Light and glare will increase above the existing condition. Typical residential lighting within the project will produce new light; however, the amount of light produced will be produced in an area of land approximately half (14 acres vs. 6.85) of what would be developed under the existing land use designation. The potential impact from light and glare on adjacent residential uses is therefore considered less than significant.

Based on the information presented above, impacts associated with the project upon aesthetics are considered less than significant.

2. Agricultural Resources

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

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

No agricultural resources are present on the site. Therefore, the proposed change in land use would have no impact on agricultural resources.

3. Air Quality

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

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The State and Federal Government require different air quality standards. Federal Government standards are adopted by the regional council of governments, and are enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). State air quality standards are adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), which distributes their authority to enforce the adopted air pollution control plan to local Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs). The CARB has adopted more stringent air quality standards than the Federal Government.

The City of Roseville, along with the South Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area (SAQMA). The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), in conjunction with SAQMA air quality management districts, and the California Air Resources Board, developed the SAQMA portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP is required to demonstrate compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments. The U.S. EPA approved the SIP in 1996, and the SAQMA has since been operating under the SIP control measures.

Under the California Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a "serious non-attainment" area for ozone and a "non-attainment" area for PM10 (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Under the Federal Clean Air Act, Placer County is classified as a serious non-attainment area for ozone, and South Placer County is in attainment for the federal PM10 standards. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for administration of air quality standards. The PCAPCD's primary responsibility is to enforce the air quality standards for point source emissions. The primary pollutants of concern are ozone and suspended particulate matter that has the potential to change air movement. These are pollutants for which this region is designated as a non-attainment area consistent with the Federal Clean Air Act.

This project is an intensification of the site from the prior developed condition, however; the project remains consistent with the development scenarios modeled for the General Plan Land Use designation of Low Density Residential and the findings and statement of overriding considerations adopted by the City for the General Plan.

As mentioned, the project will result in half the acreage (6.85 acres vs. 14 acres) originally anticipated for development; twice as much of the site will be preserved in open space. Therefore, with the reduction in the grading activities and air quality mitigation measures incorporated into the project the air quality impacts of this project would be less than cumulatively considerable.

This project alone does not have a potential to significantly degrade air quality. However, the incremental impacts associated with this project considered cumulatively with the incremental impacts of other projects will degrade air quality. The City has assessed the impacts to air quality of continued development in the City in the General Plan EIR and its cumulative impact analyses. The General Plan EIR found that the significant adverse air quality impacts cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level even with the mitigation measures proposed. Addressing the unmitigatable cumulative impacts to air quality, the General Plan EIR adopted findings of overriding consideration. However, CEQA requires that reductions in adverse project impacts be made, where it is feasible to do so.

AIR QUALITY MITIGATION MEASURES

The PCAPCD and the City of Roseville have agreed on the following mitigation measures:

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ1:

1a. Prior to approval of the Improvement Plans the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of APCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan. If no response is received from the District within 20 working days the plan shall be deemed complete, and construction may begin.

1b. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the APCD prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.

1c. Prior to approval of Grading/Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Placer County APCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ2: Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: If required by the Public Works Department, the contractor shall hold a pre-construction meeting prior to grading activities. The contractor shall invite the Placer County APCD to the pre-construction meeting in order to discuss the construction emission/dust control plan with employees and/or contractors.

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ3: Prior to building permit approval, the applicant shall show, on the plans submitted to the Building Department, that electrical outlets shall be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of all residences or all commercial buildings to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ4: Prior to building permit approval, the applicant shall show, on the plans submitted to the Building Department, provisions for construction of new residences, and

where natural gas is available, the installation of a gas outlet for use with outdoor cooking appliances, such as a gas barbecue or outdoor recreational fire pits.

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ5: Prior to building permit approval, in accordance with District Rule 225, only U.S. EPA Phase II certified wood burning devices shall be allowed in single-family residences. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed a cumulative total of 7.5 grams per hour for all devices. Masonry fireplaces shall have either a EPA certified Phase II wood burning device or shall be a U.L. Listed Decorative Gas Appliance. (Rule 225)

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ6: Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall show that all flat roofs with parapets shall include a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demands.

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ7: Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, an enforcement plan shall be established, and submitted to the APCD for review, in order to evaluate project-related on-and-off- road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities on a weekly basis, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. An Environmental Coordinator, hired by the prime contractor or property owner, and who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194)

MITIGATION MEASURE #AQ8: The following APCD rules shall be noted on the Improvement Plans:

- The project shall comply with all applicable Placer County Air Pollution Control District rules and regulation, and shall obtain applicable permits and/or clearances from the District prior to the start of construction.
- The contractor shall use CARB ultra low sulfur diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment. (California Standards for Motor Vehicle Diesel Fuel, title 13, article 4.8, chapter 9, California Code of Regulations).
- Processes that discharge 2 pounds per day or more of air contaminants, as defined by Health and Safety Code Section 39013, to the atmosphere may require a permit. Permits are required for both construction and operation. Developers/contractors should contact the District prior to construction and obtain any necessary permits prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. (Rule 501)
- Pursuant to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 501, General Permit Requirements, the proposed project may need a permit from the District prior to construction. In general, any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower or any boiler with heat greater than 1,000,000 Btu per hour shall require a permit issued by the District. (Rule 501)
- All on-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 hp or greater shall either obtain a state issued portable equipment permit or a Placer County APCD issued portable equipment permit. (California Portable Equipment Registration Program, Section 2452).
- The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators if feasible.
- During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.
- During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. (Rule 228 / section 401.2)

Short term impacts to air quality can be expected in association with construction activities. These impacts are primarily associated with grading activities and the increased potential for dust and wind driven erosion of soils. The grading activities will be reduced to an area half (6.85 acres vs. 14 acres) as much as anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Particulate matter resulting from construction dust will be reduced by implementing standard dust control measures on the job site as part of an erosion control plan. Vehicle exhaust, produced during project construction, could temporarily contribute to the deterioration of ambient air quality. The above listed mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts. Additionally, the grading permit and on-site inspection by the Public

Works Department will ensure appropriate dust control measures, such as watering are done to reduce short-term air quality impacts.

No new odor-producing activities are proposed, other than that associated with equipment exhaust during construction activities. Diesel fuel fumes may be noticeable in the vicinity of the site; however, this is a short-term effect. All equipment must comply with the mitigation measures and with California emissions standards.

4. Biological Resources

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, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project site is undeveloped and several potential biological resources have been identified on-site including Linda Creek, potential wetlands, drainage channels, oak trees, riparian habitat, grasslands, and wildlife. As such, a Biological Resources Analysis Report (BRAR) and Arborist Report were prepared for the site. The following is a discussion of the potential impacts and mitigation measures.

Wetlands:

Linda Creek bisects the property, flowing from the south to the north and eventually connecting to Folsom Lake. Linda Creek meets the Corps criteria of an “other waters” feature with the presence of a defined bed and bank, scouring, and drift lines. As identified in the biological assessment, “the creek also appears as a blue line feature in the USGS quadrangle map for Folsom”. Aquatic vegetation found within the creek includes hardstem bulrush and California blackberry. Linda Creek is located within the Open Space/Floodway zoning designation area and disturbance of the creek is not anticipated with this project.

Four main drainage channels, emptying into Linda Creek, occur on the project site. Two manmade drainage ditches occur on either side of Spahn Ranch Road. Additionally, a swale occurs on the southeast portion of the site, adjacent to Linda Creek. These drainage channels are potentially jurisdictional as well as they meet the Corps criteria for “other waters” features with the presence of a defined bank, scouring and drift lines.

Four potential wetlands were observed on-site; three being located in the area proposed for development (refer to Figure 6 in the BRAR). Wetland 1 is approximately 12 feet by 40 feet, Wetland 2 is roughly the same size as Wetland 1 but several inches deeper, and Wetland 3 is approximately 12 feet by 35 feet. Cumulatively the potential wetland area that would be impacted is approximately 0.03 acres. At the time of the survey (April 2009) water was not present within Wetland 1 and Wetland 2, yet hydrophytic vegetation (such as miner’s lettuce, common toad rush, and curly dock) were present. A drainage channel from Spahn Ranch Road flows through Wetland 3. Algal matting and hydrophytic vegetation (such as flatsedge, English plantain, curly dock, and common vetch) were found within this water feature. Wetland 4 is located in the northwest corner of the site, at the intersection of Old Auburn Road and South Cirby Road, and extends to Linda Creek. Wetland 4 is approximately 20 feet by 60 feet and is located within the Open Space/Floodway zoning designation area.

The site has been evaluated for project specific impacts to wetlands and other waters. Grading and filling of the 6.85 acre northeastern portion of the site would result in the loss of wetlands. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the Corps of Engineers regulate activities affecting wetlands and other waters. Implementation of the mitigation measure BIO1 and BIO2 listed below would ensure that permits are obtained from these agencies. Adherence to the permit would ensure that the project will result in “no net loss” of wetlands/waters and that discharge into the waters is regulated. Therefore, with the following mitigation measures, impacts to wetlands/waters are considered less than significant.

The Roseville General Plan includes policies related to wetlands preservation. They are: 1) avoid the wetlands if feasible; 2) reconstruct wetlands on-site; or 3) provide mitigation for the wetlands off-site at a replacement ratio of 1 to 1. Even with these policies, the General Plan EIR determined that development within the City would result in the loss of wetlands, and that the loss of wetlands was a significant and unavoidable impact. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will reduce the wetlands impacts to a less than significant level:

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO1: Prior to the filling of any potential wetlands or waters of the US as identified in the BRAR, a wetland delineation for the portion of the site proposed for development shall be preformed and verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers. Any on-site wetlands found to be waters of the US and subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act shall obtain appropriate permits from the US Army Corps (anticipated to be a Nationwide Permit). Additionally, a Clean Water Act Section 401 permit shall be obtained from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) to ensure the proposed discharge complies with all State water quality

requirements. The project shall implement the mitigation requirements of these permits to ensure no net loss of wetlands/waters of the US.

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO2: Prior to grading and excavation activities on-site, the developer shall obtain a grading permit to ensure that the project is in compliance with City's best management practices for water quality control and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Additionally construction activities shall not extend into the area identified as Open Space by the General Plan.

Special Status Plants:

The majority of the site consists of both native and non-native grassland habitat. Dominant vegetation consists of plant species typically found in fiddlyment loam soils, such as wild oat, red-stem filaree, Italian ryegrass, and soft chess. The northeast portion of the property however consists of ruderal grassland habitat. This area has been disturbed and was used as a stockpile site. The same plants dominate this area, but additionally California geranium, black mustard, rose clover, and California poppy were also observed. The General Plan EIR identifies the loss of annual grassland and habitat fragmentation as significant unavoidable impacts. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted by the City Council for these impacts.

Five special-status plant species were analyzed for the property based on the presence of suitable habitats and soil types. These include hispid bird's-beak, dwarf downingia, Red Bluff dwarf rush, pincushion navarretia, and Sanford's arrowhead. No occurrences of these species were observed on the property or in the vicinity, with the exception of the Sanford's arrowhead. The timeframe for development of the project site is not known at this time, nor is the Sanford's arrowhead exact locations known on the site. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO3 will ensure that the potential impact to this special status plant is considered less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will reduce the special-status plants impacts to a less than significant level:

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO3: Prior to grading, a survey for any Sanford's arrowhead on the site (in accordance with CDFG and CNPS guidelines) is required. The survey must be conducted during the Sanford's arrowhead blooming season (May to October). If this species is found onsite, the developer is responsible for coordinating with the appropriate agencies (CDFG, USFWS) to develop appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures.

Special Status Wildlife:

Several special-status wildlife species are known to occur or potentially occur within the jurisdictional area of the General Plan EIR, which includes the project site. The site contains potential habitat for the several special-status invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, foraging and nesting raptor species, bird species and mammals listed by the California Department of Fish and Game. Of the special-species with the potential of habitating the site, only a red-tailed hawk was observed on-site. With the exception of northwestern pond turtle and the red-tailed hawk, impacts to the special-status wildlife are considered less than significant. The loss of vegetation could destroy nesting habitat. Therefore, pre-construction surveys should be conducted to confirm the absence of special status wildlife. With the mitigation measures identified the impact to these two species is considered less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will reduce the special-status wildlife impacts to a less than significant level:

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO4: Perform pre-construction surveys for nesting birds and raptors at least 30 days in advance of construction if construction is planned during January to July. If the survey does not identify any special-status birds or raptors species, no further mitigation is required. If nesting is found to be occurring, avoid disturbance of the nest site with a suitable buffer zone. The on-site biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish & Game to determine the size of the no-disturbance buffer (typically between 150 to 200 feet). Additionally, if Swainson's

hawk are found to be using the site in any capacity, off-site mitigation would be required at a ratio deemed suitable by the CDFG.

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO5: Due to the creek’s potential for a steelhead spawning run, a 200-foot buffer should be in effect for all construction activities. If the buffer is not possible, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) will need to be contacted and a formal Section 7 permit with the USFWS may be required.

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO6: Prior to construction activities and during the months of March to October, a survey of the site should be conducted to determine the presence or absence of the northwestern pond turtle. If presence, appropriate mitigation measures to protect the species include the permanent preservation of aquatic breeding habitat and adjacent grasslands. In order to prevent the accidental “take” of this species during construction, a survey shall be conducted 72 hours prior to the removal of vegetation and or/construction.

Native Oak Trees:

The site is populated with multiple native oak trees. According to an arborist report prepared for the project (see Attachment 7), the native oaks consist of *Quercus douglassii* (Blue Oak), *Quercus wislizeni* (Interior Live Oak), and *Quercus lobata* (Valley Oak). As shown on the tree removal exhibit (Attachment 6) the majority of the native oaks are located along Linda creek and Spahn Ranch Road.

In compliance with the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, the property owner will be required to mitigate on an inch-for-inch basis for protected trees that are to be removed. The improvements to Spahn Ranch Road will require removal of 10 native oaks (tree nos. 1-10) totaling 137 inches of diameter at breast height. The developer will be required to mitigate for the loss of all 137 inches. Additionally it may be necessary for tree number 116, located on Lot 1, to be removed for development of the lot. If it is determined necessary, an additional six inches of mitigation shall be included in the total inches of protected oaks lost. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO7 will ensure that a mitigation plan outlining mitigation for the total inches lost is submitted prior to the removal of any native oak trees. Mitigation may include a combination of on-site re-vegetation and the payment of in-lieu fees into the City’s Oak Tree Mitigation Fund, which requires a payment of \$118 per inch removed. With mitigation, impacts to native oaks are considered less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measure will reduce the native oak tree impacts to a less than significant level:

MITIGATION MEASURE #BIO7: Prior to removal of any native oak trees and grading permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a tree mitigation plan for the project, in compliance with the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, that proposes to mitigate for the protected trees removed.

5. 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	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

No cultural resources are known to exist on the project site. While it is anticipated that there will be no impacts to cultural resources, the project will be conditioned to adhere to the General Plan EIR mitigation measures that require, in the event of a discovery of buried archeological or historic deposits, project activity in the vicinity to be halted until a qualified archeologist can assess the resources and provide management. Impacts to potential cultural resources are therefore considered to be less than significant.

6. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

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:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems				X

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a. The project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides.

i-iii) The project site is located in Roseville which is in Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the South Placer area as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The risk associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic related ground failure to new structures is low and therefore the impact is 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 existing and proposed slopes are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are considered less than significant.

b. Grading activities will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). Grading activities for the project will be limited to the project site. The Engineering Department will review the Grading and Improvement Plans for consistency with the City's improvement standards.

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

Also, prior to any grading activities, the State Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) requires preparation and approval of a Soil Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan for this site, given the presence of lead in the soil on a portion of the site. Grading and construction activities will be conducted to the satisfaction of DTSC and associated permit requirements.

c-d. The project site is not located in a sensitive geologic area and does not expose people to potential geologic impacts. Additionally, the Roseville General Plan finds such impacts to be less than significant since new buildings and structures are required to comply with all applicable building codes. A soil report is required with the submittal of the improvement plans. The City of Roseville Building Department will review construction plans before a building permit is issued and the Engineering Division will review and approve all rough grading plans to ensure that all grading and structures would withstand shrink-swell potentials and earthquake activity in this area.

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

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

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

Additional households could increase the risk of improper disposal of hazardous materials. Household hazardous waste impacts are, however, a less than significant impact due to the implementation of a household hazardous waste program, according to the General Plan EIR. Based on this information, potential impacts associated with hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.

This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services. The project will cause a less than significant impact to the City's Emergency Response or Management Plans.

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

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

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?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The proposed project will result in over-covering of soils with impervious surfaces such as asphalt paving and residential structures. This will result in a reduced rate of absorption of surface water runoff and will increase water being directed into the City’s drainage system. The City evaluated the potential impacts related to increased runoff in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR assumed full build-out of the site and other properties in the City and evaluated downstream flooding impacts resulting from increased surface water runoff. The General Plan EIR found that, with the implementation of City standards and programs, the potential flooding impacts would be less than significant. No development will occur within the 100-year flood hazard area (regulatory floodplain). In addition, all homes will be located a minimum of two feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation in accordance with the City Improvement Standards and General Plan policies. The City standards will include requirements for a drainage system designed in accordance with City standards that will adequately handle on-site drainage associated with the development of the property. The proposed project will be subject to the adopted City standards and programs. As a result, the flooding impacts will be less than significant.

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

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

Based on the above information, the impacts associated with water are less than significant.

9. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The property is currently designated with Low Density Residential land use (1.8 units per acre). The proposed project will increase the residential density of the parcel (to 4.8 units per acre); however, the land use (Low Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The Low Density Residential (LDR) land use category anticipates a residential density range from 0.5 – 6.9 units per acre. The projects resultant density increase is still within the General Plan density range for the LDR land use category.

The project would be adding seven (7) additional units to the Infill planning area. The additional units would create an insignificant increase to the overall 15,409 units within the Infill planning area and the overall units within the City. The General Plan EIR assumed development of the site with an LDR land use and 25 units. No localized impacts have been identified as a result of the increase in density. Therefore, no further environmental analysis is required with respect to the unit increase.

The addition of seven units over half the acreage previously anticipated will result in a more compact development on the site. This is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint Implementation Plan, for which the City has adopted a policy to encourage “Blueprint” compact developments. The project also assists the City in providing its “fair share” of housing units allocated in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) plan adopted by SACOG.

In addition to the project consistency with the General Plan - Land Use Element policies, the project is consistent with the Open Space and Conservation Element policies and Safety Element policies. As a result of the General Plan Amendment and Rezone, no development will occur within the 100 year floodplain. The floodplain area will be preserved in Open Space. Linda Creek and surrounding riparian areas are considered natural resources. These resources will also be preserved in the Open Space land use designation area. The project will additionally dedicate 7.15 acres of open space not previously anticipated, consistent with the GP policy to maximize opportunities for preservation of and maintenance of open space.

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

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

10. 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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project site is not known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance, therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources.

11. 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?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

Construction activities on the site could expose nearby tenants/landowners to increased noise levels, including ground-born vibrations. These impacts are temporary in nature (being associated with construction of the units) and are not anticipated to result in any unusual or excessive ground-born vibration or noise levels. Construction activities will be occurring on half the acreage assumed in the General Plan EIR. The amount of nearby properties potentially affected by construction noise would also be reduced. In addition, construction hours are limited by the City's Municipal Code Section 9.24 to daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Saturday, Sunday and Holidays.). The difference in the amount of noise produced during and after construction from 25 units versus 32 units is less than significant. These potential noise impacts are therefore considered less than significant.

A slight increase in project-related traffic will cause a slight increase in traffic-related noise. The project will not create an excessive amount of traffic beyond that anticipated with the existing Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation. No permanent noise increase from a different mix of uses will occur as the project will retain the LDR land use designation. Consistent with the City's design guidelines, the project will be conditioned to install a sound wall along Old Auburn Road. In addition to standard noise reducing construction techniques, the sound wall will ensure that the City's standards of 60 db exterior and 45db interior noise levels for residential units is not exceeded.

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. No housing is proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur relative to exposing people to excessive airport related noise levels.

Because the project would comply with the provisions of the City's General Plan and Noise Ordinance, impacts related to noise are considered less than significant.

12. 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?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The project will result in an increase in the number of housing units over what was anticipated in the General Plan EIR. As noted above, the seven additional units would result in an insignificant increase (7 out of 15,040±) to the overall units within the Infill planning area, and will not induce substantial population growth. The project would increase the density of the site, however only slightly if the residential acreage were to be held constant (2.3 units per acre vs. 1.8 units per acre). This density is consistent with the densities of surrounding LDR parcels. Potential environmental impacts from the increases in units has been evaluated in other sections and determined to have a less than significant impact.

The project will contribute one additional low income affordable housing unit of the 32 purchase units; therefore, the project will not displace affordable housing. The proposed increase in units allocated to the property will increase the number of units that can be sold at market rate, which will assist the applicant in producing the one affordable unit required of the project. The project will have a less than significant impact on housing and population.

13. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the 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?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The subject property is in an area of the City that currently receives City services. The General Plan anticipated residential development for the site and planned for services accordingly. Police has determined that the increase in units will not affect service to the area. Fire Station #4 is located in close proximity to the site and allows the Fire department to reach the site within the standard four-minute time frame at least 80% of the time. The Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined that it will have a less than significant impact on existing services. The project will be conditioned to comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes used by the City of Roseville to ensure that adequate water pressure is provided on the site, and it is anticipated that fire services to the site will be provided in conformance with City standards. As a result of these measures, the potential impacts to public services are considered less than significant.

The school facility planning model anticipated 25 units allocated to the site, which would generate six high school students, 12 K-6 students, and three 7-8 students. The students would be housed at Sargeant Elementary School for elementary and Eich Intermediate for junior high. Both schools have adequate capacity to accommodate these students. The increase of seven units would potentially add two students within the Oakmont High attendance area. With a district of 9,000 students, the impact would be less than significant. The incremental increase of students anticipated to be generated from the new units would not result in the added need for new school facilities. Each house within the project will be required to pay Infill school fees to mitigate any impacts. Therefore, the potential impact to school facilities is considered less than significant.

The project is adjacent to Placer County to the east and near the Sacramento County line to the south. The City notified Placer County and Sacramento County of the project. Both agencies have not provided any comments. Public services for the project will be provided by the City of Roseville. The City collaborated with Placer County on the roadway improvements proposed for Sphan Ranch Road and Old Auburn Road. Impacts to the adjacent county roadways and other county facilities and services is anticipated to be less than significant given the small number of additional “new” units.

14. Recreation

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The General Plan contains a policy requiring nine acres of parkland per every 1000 residents. The addition of seven new units over the original allocation generates a parkland dedication requirement of 0.138 acres of city wide, neighborhood and open space. Even with the incremental increase in residents generated for the seven new units, this parkland standard will be maintained. The project includes the dedication of 6.75 acres of open space. Additionally, the units will pay neighborhood and City wide park fees at issuance of a building permit. With the combination of both open space land dedication and the payment of park fees, the potential impact to park services is considered less than significant.

15. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The City's traffic model currently assumes development of the site with 25 single-family lots. The proposed project includes 32 lots, which would increase PM peak hour traffic volumes by six vehicles and daily volumes by 54 vehicles. The City improvement standards require that a long term traffic study be prepared if the increase in PM peak hour traffic volumes exceed 50 vehicles. Since the increase from the proposed project is only six vehicles during peak hour, a long term traffic study is not required and the proposed increase in peak hour trips is considered less than significant.

The project will be conditioned to provide roadway improvements along Old Auburn Road and Sphan Ranch Road to improve traffic and circulation. The right side of Sphan Ranch Road is within Placer County. The new roadway improvements and connection were therefore agreed upon with Placer County. The roadway improvement and new streets within the development will be required to comply with the City Improvement Standards. The City's Fire and Police Departments have reviewed the internal and external roadway improvements and determined they meet emergency access requirements.

Plot plans will be reviewed to ensure that parking for the project is provided in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, which requires two parking spaces per unit. Therefore, parking impacts to surrounding properties is not anticipated.

The City's Alternative Transportation has reviewed the plans to ensure that a safe route to school can be provided from the site. As part of the project, sidewalks will be added along Old Auburn Road. With the addition of the sidewalks, pedestrians will have a safe path to the signal controlled crosswalk connecting to Citywide sidewalks and the surrounding schools.

Based on the above information, the project impacts associated with transportation/circulation and parking is considered less than significant.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

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?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The various utility departments have reviewed the project to ensure that the project would not have a greater impact on existing and planned supplies or localized infrastructure improvements. Although the project will

increase the amount of units beyond those anticipated in the General Plan EIR, the various utility departments have determined that the additional units will not result in a significant demand for new services and the existing infrastructure can accommodate the anticipated demand. Therefore, the potential impacts to utilities are considered less than significant.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:

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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

Long term environmental goals are not impacted by the proposed project. The cumulative impacts do not deviate beyond what was contemplated by the 2020 General Plan EIR. The proposed change in land use does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of any wildlife species nor create adverse effects on human beings. Any increase in impacts is offset by the reduction in developed area and the increase in area permanently preserved in open space.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

As shown in the checklist prepared as part of this Initial Study, City staff has not identified any impacts that are not peculiar to the parcel that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels, whether offsite or cumulative in

nature, which were not discussed in the North Central Roseville Specific Plan or General Plan EIRs or for which the impacts are greater than anticipated in either EIR. This determination is based on a review of the project specific studies, General Plan EIR, the North Central Roseville Specific Plan EIR, and the WRSP EIR. City staff has determined through review of these documents and the subsequent development conducted there under that the mitigation measures contained within these documents have been undertaken. Specifically, City staff has determined that the Fountains Specific Plan Amendment project is compliant with the mitigation measures identified in the North Central Roseville Specific Plan and General Plan EIRs.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Initial Study Prepared by:

Gina LaTorra, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Planning & Redevelopment Department

ATTACHMENTS

1. General Plan Amendment Exhibit
2. Rezone Exhibit
3. Tentative Parcel Map
4. Preliminary Grading Plan (2 pages)
5. Utility Plan
6. Tree Removal Exhibit
7. Tree Survey and Assessment of Impacts, Sierra Nevada Arborists – January 27, 2009
8. Biological Resources Analysis Report, Olberding Environmental, Inc. – May 2009