CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

for the

WASHINGTON BOULEVARD/ANDORA BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

September 2019

1 INTRODUCTION

The environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the Washington Boulevard/Andora Bridge Improvement Project (project) addresses the potential environmental effects associated with constructing and operating a road widening project along a 1.4-mile section of Washington Boulevard between All-America City Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the City of Roseville. These findings have been prepared to comply with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). These findings refer to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) or Final EIR where the material appears in either of those documents. Otherwise, references are to the Draft EIR.

CEQA generally requires that a lead agency must take reasonable efforts to mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts when approving a project. In order to effectively evaluate any potentially significant environmental impacts of a proposed project, an EIR must be prepared. The EIR is an informational document that serves to inform the agency decision-making body and the public in general of any potentially significant environmental impacts. The preparation of an EIR also serves as a medium for identifying possible methods of minimizing any significant effects and assessing and describing a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the project.

The EIR for this project was prepared by the City of Roseville (City) as the "lead agency" in accordance with CEQA and has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated effects of the project. The City, as the lead agency, has the principal responsibility for approval of the project.

2 TERMINOLOGY OF FINDINGS

CEQA requires that, for each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency decision-making body must issue a written finding reaching one or more of the three allowable conclusions:

1. Changes or alterations which avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR have been required or incorporated into the project;
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including consideration for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Draft EIR (PRC Section 21081, subds. (a)(1)–(a)(3); see also CEQA Guidelines, Section15091, subds. (a)(1)–(a)(3)).

For purposes of these findings, the terms listed below will have the following definitions:

- "Mitigation measures" shall constitute the "changes or alterations" discussed above.
- "Avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level.
- "Feasible," pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

- "Selected Project" refers to the Transportation Commission-recommended selection for the proposed project which includes temporary closure of Washington Boulevard to reduce the duration of Phase 2 construction. An alternative construction approach that maintains one-lane controlled traffic conditions during construction, is described and analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR as Alternative 1.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Washington Boulevard/Andora Bridge Widening Improvement Project is a road and railroad bridge widening project proposed along a 1.4-mile section of Washington Boulevard between All-America City Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard in the City of Roseville (City). The project includes road and railroad bridge widening, drainage, intersection and signalization improvements, as well as bike/pedestrian improvements designed to improve safety for the traveling public. The proposed Class 1 trail would provide a continuous multi-use trail for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized vehicle users and would connect neighborhoods, parks, schools, businesses, and natural areas, with other planned Class 1 facilities and the on-street bikeway/pedestrian system north and south of project.

3.2 THE PROJECT

The project proposes improvements along an approximately 1.4-mile section of existing Washington Boulevard right-of-way in the City of Roseville. The project involves widening a 0.85-mile section of Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard from two to four lanes and replacing the existing 100-year-old Washington Boulevard Andora Underpass beneath the Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR). The project also includes expansion of existing Class 1 bike/pedestrian multi-use trail facilities and related safety enhancements.

The project is currently planned for construction in 2 Phases. Phase 1 includes most of the road widening (with the exception of at the Andora Underpass), most Class I bike trail and intersection improvements (including a new signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection) and is proposed for construction in summer 2020. Phase 2 would include completing widening of Washington Boulevard at the Andora Underpass, final drainage improvements including the proposed bio-retention basin, a sound wall on the east side of Washington Boulevard south of Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and improvements at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection. The schedule for Phase 2 construction is currently unknown and subject to funding availability.

The project is needed because recurring morning and evening peak-period demand exceeds the current design capacity of Washington Boulevard, creating traffic operation and safety issues for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. These issues result in moderate delays, wasted fuel and safety concerns which are expected to be exacerbated by anticipated increases in traffic from future population and employment growth.

The City's Transportation System 2035 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identifies improvements to Washington Boulevard, including the widening of Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard, to improve traffic circulation and pedestrian traffic through the area. Approximately 18,000 vehicles per day travel through this segment, and the road improvements would enhance accessibility for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists along Washington Boulevard and nearby intersections.

The proposed project would provide better connectivity between the existing two-lane, 0.85-mile segment of Washington Boulevard and the existing four-lane segments of Washington Boulevard and would provide an evacuation route in case of an emergency. The improvements would also offer a better and more continuous route for pedestrians and bicyclists, who are currently forced to detour off Washington Boulevard and onto Derek Place. The project's major components include:

- Widening approximately 0.85 mile of Washington Boulevard from two to four lanes with a raised median separating northbound and southbound traffic (Phase 1).
- Widening the Andora Underpass to a two-span bridge with columns located in the roadway median island to accommodate the additional two lanes (Phase 2).
- Improving the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection by lowering the intersection to conform to the new Washington Boulevard road elevation on the south and removing an existing hump across Washington Boulevard (Phase 2).
- Installing a new traffic signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection (Phase 1 - should appropriate grant funding be obtained).
- Modifying the existing traffic signal at the Washington Boulevard/Diamond Oaks Road intersection to conform to the new four-lane roadway (Phase 1).
- Adding 8-foot-wide Class II (i.e., on-street with appropriate signing and striping) bike lanes along both sides of Washington Boulevard (Phases 1 and 2).
- Extending the existing Class I bike path on the east side of Washington Boulevard from a point approximately 150 south of Diamond Oaks Road to All-America City Boulevard with a 10- to 12-foot-wide path parallel to Washington Boulevard (Phase 1).
- Removing the existing bicycle/pedestrian crossing under UPRR (Phase 2) and providing a new temporary connection between the existing Derek Place bike path and the new Class I bike path along Washington Boulevard (described above) (Phase 1).
- Adding a new 8- to 12-foot-wide multiuse path on the west side of Washington Boulevard between Emerald Oaks Road and Kaseberg Drive (Phases 1 and 2). Portions of this proposed multiuse path may be deferred beyond Phase 2 until additional construction funding is available.
- Conducting floodplain, water quality, and drainage improvements (Phase 1 and 2).
- Relocating existing utilities, including sewer, water, telecommunications, and natural gas (Phases 1 and 2).
- Potentially constructing a sound wall adjacent to residential areas along Washington Boulevard (to be determined during Phase 2).
- Temporarily restriping Foothills Boulevard at Junction Boulevard to provide two left-turn lanes from southbound Foothills Boulevard to eastbound Junction Boulevard to accommodate traffic management during widening of the Andora Underpass (Phase 2).

3.3 PROJECT SITE

The proposed project is in the City of Roseville, Placer County, along an approximately 1.45-mile segment of Washington Boulevard between All-America City Boulevard on the south and Pleasant

Grove Boulevard on the north (see Draft EIR Figure 1-2). At the southern end of the project area, the UPRR line runs along the east side of Washington Boulevard, crosses over the road just south of South Branch Pleasant Grove Creek and continues along the west side of the road toward Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The southern end of the project area includes commercial development to the east (followed by the railroad and then residential uses) and the Placer County Fairgrounds and All-American Speedway to the west. North of Junction Boulevard, the project area is bordered by commercial development to the east and residential areas to the west. The Diamond Oaks and Kaseberg-Kingswood neighborhoods are adjacent to the central and northern portions of the project area. City-designated General Open Space lands occupy the area immediately west and north of the Andora Underpass. Residential development is present on both sides of Washington Boulevard between the Andora Underpass and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. An existing Class I (i.e., off-street) bike path along the east side of Washington Boulevard connects Diamond Oaks Road to Derek Place and an existing Class I path extends approximately 1,200 feet south of Junction Boulevard to Corporation Yard Road on the east side of Washington Boulevard. Draft EIR Figure 2-1 shows an overview of the proposed project and existing conditions.

3.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve existing and future traffic; enhance access and safety for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists; and meet railroad clearance requirements. The proposed project would also provide better connectivity between the existing two-lane, 0.85-mile segment of Washington Boulevard and the existing four-lane segments of Washington Boulevard, and would provide an evacuation route in case of an emergency. In addition, the improvements would offer a better and more continuous route for pedestrians and bicyclists, who are currently forced to detour off Washington Boulevard onto Derek Place.

The project is needed because recurring morning and evening peak-period traffic demand exceeds the current design capacity of Washington Boulevard, creating traffic operation and safety issues for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. These issues result in moderate delays and wasted fuel, which are expected to be exacerbated by anticipated increases in traffic from future population and employment growth.

The proposed project's objectives are as follows:

- Implement the adopted CIP improvements for the segment of Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
- Improve vehicular traffic flow along Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard by widening the road and the Andora Underpass.
- Enhance access and safety along this segment of Washington Boulevard for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists by widening the boulevard and adding a signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection.
- Provide a better and more continuous route for pedestrians and bicyclists on Washington Boulevard than the existing detour onto the more isolated Derek Place and extend the existing Class I bike trail south to All-America City Boulevard.
- Provide a consistent four-lane roadway along this length of Washington Boulevard by connecting the existing four-lane segments on either side of Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
- Improve traffic safety by alleviating the Andora Underpass' existing substandard vertical clearance and width.

Direct consideration of cost is not required under CEQA. However, efforts to attain this objective are part of the design process employed by the City in meeting its health, welfare and economic obligations to the citizens of Roseville.

3.5 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the project would require removal of vegetation, wetlands and existing features including demolition of the existing Union Pacific Andora Underpass, grading, placement of aggregate base material for road widening and temporary railroad shoefly track, construction of drainage improvements, multi-use trials, intersection, sound wall and signal improvements.

The project would include construction staging areas where equipment would be temporarily stored during project construction. The construction staging areas would occur on City owned property and/or within the City's existing right-of-way or on property acquired by the City or its contractor for temporary construction use.

The project is proposed to be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 mostly includes the majority of road widening (with the exception of widening at the Andora Underpass) and most Class I bike trail and intersection improvements (including the new signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection). Phase I would be constructed during summer 2020. Phase 2 would include completing the widening of Washington Boulevard at the Andora Underpass, final drainage improvements including the proposed bio-retention basin, sound wall installation, and improvements at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection. The schedule for Phase 2 construction is currently unknown and subject to funding availability.

3.6 REQUIRED DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

The City of Roseville is the lead agency for the project. As required by Section 15124(d)(1)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must contain a list of permits and other approvals required to implement the project. The project requires the following approvals:

- **EIR Certification**. Before the City can approve the project, the City Council must certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Roseville. Approval of the project also requires adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which specifies the methods for monitoring mitigation measures required to eliminate or reduce the project's significant effects on the environment. The City will also adopt CEQA Findings of Fact regarding any significant effects on the environment and, for any effects determined to be significant and unavoidable, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, as part of project approval. Action by the City Council follows a recommendation from the City of Roseville Transportation Commission. The City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk and State Clearinghouse to conclude the CEQA process.

- **Project Approval.** After certification of the EIR, the City Council will consider approval of the proposed project or Alternative 1: One Lane Closure During Construction. If the City Council approves the project with or without Alternative 1, staff will proceed with final design and permitting and return to City Council for bid authorization and construction contract award.

Several agencies would be involved in the consideration and approval of project elements. Federal, state, and regional agency approvals and permits that would be considered for the project would include wetlands verification, encroachment, water quality, and streambed alteration permits. State and regional responsible agencies and federal agencies with approval authority would include:

- Regional and State Responsible Agencies:
  - California Department of Fish and Wildlife
  - Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Federal Agencies:
  - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
  - Federal Highway Administration (NEPA authority delegated to Caltrans)

4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with PRC Section 21092 and CCR Section 15082, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 12, 2016 to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document. The NOP was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, posted on the City of Roseville website (http://www.roseville.ca.us/transportation/bikeways/dc_study.asp), made available at the City Clerk's office and the City of Roseville Permit Center, and distributed directly to potential responsible and trustee agencies. The NOP was circulated for 30 days, through October 15, 2016. In accordance with PRC Section 21083.9 and CCR Section 15082(c), a noticed scoping meeting for the EIR occurred on September 21, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. at Cirby Elementary School, 814 Darling Way, Roseville, CA 95678.

The City also held a public scoping meeting on September 21, 2016, to solicit verbal and written comments from the public and public agencies. Final EIR Table 1-1 summarizes all comments received during the Notice of Preparation comment period, including those received at the September 21, 2016 public scoping meeting, via email and U.S. Mail. Appendix A contains the full Notice of Preparation, a comprehensive Public Scoping Meeting summary report, and all NOP comment letters received via U.S. Mail.

The Draft EIR was published on June 17, 2019. A CEQA Notice of Completion and copies of the Draft EIR were filed with the State Clearinghouse. A 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR was provided, ending on August 1, 2019. The Notice of Availability and the Draft EIR are posted on the City's website. A public hearing during the public comment period was held at the City of Roseville Transportation Commission meeting on July 16, 2019. The City published the Final EIR for the project in September 2019. The Final EIR includes comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to issues raised in the comments, and revisions to the text of the Draft EIR. The Final EIR and the Draft EIR constitute the EIR for the project.

5 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For the purposes of CEQA, and the findings herein set forth, the administrative record for the project consists of those items listed in PRC Section 21167.6, subdivision (e). The record of proceedings for the City's decision on the project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the project;
- The Draft EIR for the project and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIR;

- The Final EIR for the project, including comments received on the Draft EIR; the City's responses to those comments; technical appendices; and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- The Transportation Commission staff report for July 16, 2019;
- Minutes and/or transcripts of the Transportation Commission public meeting held on July 16, 2019;
- The City Council staff report;
- Minutes and/or transcripts of the City Council public meeting held to certify the Final EIR;
- All other reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the City or consultants to the City with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the project;
- All resolutions or findings adopted by the City regarding the project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions or findings;
- The City's General Plan and all updates and related environmental analyses;
- Relevant sections of the City's Zoning Code;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15091(e), the administrative record of these proceedings is located at, and may be obtained from, the City's Development Services Department at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678. The custodian of these documents and other materials is the City Clerk.

The City Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decisions on the project even if not every document was formally presented to the City Council or City Staff as part of the City files generated in connection with the project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the City Council was aware in approving the project. (See *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to City Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the City Council as the final decision-making body.

For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the City Council's decisions relating to approval of the project. (See PRC, Section 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

6 FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

PRC Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to provide that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or

such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in PRC Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. As noted earlier, the first such finding is that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. The second permissible finding is that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. The third potential conclusion is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091). PRC Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations.

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*); (*Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant's project objectives]; see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 *(CNPS) ["*an alternative 'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'"] (quoting Kostka & Zischke, *Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act* [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (*Kostka*), Section 17.309, p. 825); In *re Bay- Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (*Bay-Delta*) ["[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary program objectives"; "a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal"].) Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar*, *supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also *CNPS*, *supra,* 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 *["an alternative that 'is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint' may be rejected as infeasible"*] [quoting Kostka, *supra,* Section 17.29, p. 824]; *San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

For purposes of these findings (including Table 1 as described below), the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less-than-significant level. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid[ed] *or* substantially lessen[ed]," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether or not the effect in question has been "avoided" (i.e., reduced to a less-than-significant level).

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency (CEQA Guidelines Section15091, subd. (a), (b)).

The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II*, *supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

The EIR identified four environmental issue areas (aesthetics, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation/traffic) with subject to significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from the selected project, and thus a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared.

7 LEGAL EFFECT OF FINDINGS

These findings constitute the City's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the selected project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the City hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the City adopts a resolution approving the project.

8 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the selected project and is being approved by the City Council by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The MMRP is Appendix A to the Final EIR and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

9 SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

9.1 TABLE OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND CEQA FINDINGS

The City Council's findings with respect to the selected project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the table attached to these findings ("Table 1"). The findings set forth in the table are hereby incorporated by reference and the Council adopts all of the mitigation measures identified therein. This table does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the EIR. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft or Final EIR and adopted by the City Council, and states the City Council's findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Draft and Final EIRs, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the selected project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft and Final EIRs, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the

determinations and conclusions of the Draft and Final EIRs relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

10 FINDINGS REGARDING RECIRCULATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The City Council adopts the following findings with respect to whether to recirculate the Draft EIR. Under Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5):

1. A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
2. A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
3. A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
4. The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is "not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) "Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule." (*Ibid.*)

The City Council recognizes that the Final EIR contains responses to comments received, the MMRP, and modifications to the Draft EIR. The information contained within the Final EIR involves no "significant new information" triggering recirculation because the information did not result in any new significant environmental effects or any substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant effects and did not otherwise trigger recirculation. Under such circumstances, the City finds that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

11 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

11.1 BASIS FOR ALTERNATIVES

As discussed previously, CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where significant environmental impacts will not occur. As is evident from the text of the EIR and the attached table

describing the disposition of the significant effects of the project, most significant effects of the selected project have been avoided (that is, rendered less than significant) by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There are seven total impacts to four environmental issue areas that remain significant and unavoidable.

Under CEQA, project alternatives are developed in order to give agency decision-makers options for reducing or eliminating significant environmental effects of proposed projects while still meeting most, if not all, of the basic project objectives. "Alternatives and mitigation measures have the same function – diminishing or avoiding adverse environmental effects." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 403.) The City Council sets forth below its reasons for concluding that all such alternatives are infeasible within the meaning of CEQA.

11.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

As noted previously, the purpose of an alternatives analysis is to develop alternatives to a proposed project that substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects identified as a result of the project, while still meeting most, if not all, of the basic project objectives. The State CEQA Guidelines state that an EIR should identify alternatives that were initially considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible and explain the reasons for the determination (Section 15126.6[c]). As described in the Draft EIR, the City conducted an extensive public outreach/planning process as part of consideration of alternatives for the project. This included holding public workshops to present alternative construction approaches that involve varying degrees of temporary construction closure and detours. Public feedback was requested, and polling results were used to define the EIR's proposed project and alternatives.

11.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE EIR

The alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR are briefly described below.

- Alternative 1 – One Lane Closure during Construction
- Alternative 2 – No Project

11.3.1 No Project Alternative

DESCRIPTION

Under the No Project Alternative, the Washington Boulevard/Andora Bridge Improvement Project would not be constructed. Washington Boulevard between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and All-America City Boulevard, including the Andora Underpass, would remain a 2-lane facility with limited bike and pedestrian facilities.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The No Project Alternative would produce no changes on the project site, because the site would remain in its current condition, effectively eliminating the project impacts discussed in the Draft EIR. There would be no air emissions associated with project construction and there would be no increases in short-term construction-related transportation/traffic, aesthetic, noise, or vibration impacts. There would be no potential for construction-related disturbance of special-status plant or animal species or

their habitat or disturbance or loss of riparian, wetlands or other waters of the U.S. There would be no potential to unearth any unknown subsurface cultural or historic resources. Roadway operations under the no project (cumulative 2035) condition would result in marginally greater NOx and carbon monoxide and GHG emissions than under the proposed project. The No Project alternative would also result in a greater degradation of both AM and PM peak hour operations than would the proposed project at the intersections of Washington Boulevard with Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Diamond Oaks Road/Emerald Oak Road, and Junction Boulevard. Finally, bike/pedestrian multi-use trail connections and related safety enhancements would not be made.

FEASIBILITY/RELATIONSHIP TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The purpose and objectives of the proposed project are to improve existing and future traffic circulation; enhance access and safety for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists; and meet railroad clearance requirements. The No Project Alternative would not meet the project's most basic objectives. It would not:

- Improve vehicular traffic flow along Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard by widening the road and the Andora Underpass.
- Enhance access and safety along this segment of Washington Boulevard for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists by widening the boulevard and adding a signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection.
- Provide a better and more continuous route for pedestrians and bicyclists on Washington Boulevard than the existing detour onto the more isolated Derek Place and extend the existing Class I bike trail south to All-America City Boulevard.
- Provide a consistent four-lane roadway along this length of Washington Boulevard by connecting the existing four-lane segments on either side of Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

The City Council finds these project objectives related to providing improved roadway level of service and developing a continuous Class 1 trail alignment compelling. Because the No Project Alternative would not meet the project's basic objectives, the City Council rejects the No Project Alternative set forth and evaluated in the EIR because this alternative fails to meet objectives for the project. Therefore, the City finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that make this alternative infeasible. In making this determination, the City Council is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors."

11.3.2 Alternative 1: One Lane Closure

DESCRIPTION

Alternative 1 is designed to satisfy the project objectives (see draft EIR Section S.3, *Project Objectives*), while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts associated with the project. The alignment and associated project components of Alternative 1 are the same as those described for the proposed project and involve the same improvements to Washington Boulevard; however, Alternative 1 differs in its construction approach, including traffic diversion and schedule. The primary difference from the proposed project is that it would leave one lane open during construction and would require an estimated 20 to 24 months to construct because a temporary railroad bridge is required over Washington Boulevard to maintain train traffic.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Alternative 1 would reduce the impacts on traffic and intersections caused by rerouting existing traffic from Washington Boulevard to other streets during its multi-month closure during construction of the proposed new Andora Undercrossing. Alternative 1 would reduce the substantial increases in project-related traffic on the parallel segment of Foothills Boulevard and Diamond Oaks Road east of Washington Boulevard. Alternative 1 would also reduce the project's effects on the following intersections during the construction closure of Washington Boulevard.

- Foothills Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard—westbound left-turn movement.
- Foothills Boulevard/Junction Boulevard—southbound left-turn movement and westbound right-turn movement during the PM peak hour.
- Roseville Parkway/Reserve Drive—eastbound right-turn movement and northbound left-turn movement during the PM peak hour.
- Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard—northbound left-turn movement during the PM peak hour.

Under Alternative 1, Washington Boulevard vehicular traffic would be allowed to pass through the project site under the control of one-way flagging operations during some of the construction phases. However, the travelling public would still be significantly delayed during construction of Alternative 1 because it would not be possible to maintain two lanes of traffic flow during most of the construction period; therefore, more than half of the normal traffic would use an alternative route.

FEASIBILITY/RELATIONSHIP TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 1 would be similar to the proposed project and would meet most of the following project objectives in a similar manner.

- Improve vehicular traffic flow along Washington Boulevard between Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard by widening the road and the Andora Underpass.
- Enhance access and safety along this segment of Washington Boulevard for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists by widening the boulevard and adding a signal at the Washington Boulevard/Kaseberg Drive intersection.
- Provide a better and more continuous route for pedestrians and bicyclists on Washington Boulevard than the existing detour onto the more isolated Derek Place and extend the existing Class I bike trail south to All-America City Boulevard.
- Provide a consistent four-lane roadway along this length of Washington Boulevard by connecting the existing four-lane segments on either side of Sawtell Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

As described in the EIR, because the location and physical characteristics would be the same, Alternative 1 (one lane closure during construction) and the proposed project would generally result in the same types and levels of both construction and operational impacts on most resources. For all other resources, nearly all impacts would be comparable for Alternative 1 and the proposed project. Exceptions to these similarities are primarily associated with full closure of Washington Boulevard under the proposed project and the longer duration of construction under Alternative 1. These exceptions include nighttime lighting during construction, air quality impacts associated with construction emissions, construction noise impacts, and traffic delays during construction. Nighttime construction lighting would have a marginally more severe impact under Alternative 1 because

Alternative 1's extended construction period (20 months) would result in a longer period of construction lighting on the project site. Likewise, construction-related air quality impacts of Alternative 1 would be slightly greater than those of the proposed project. During construction, Alternative 1 would generate slightly higher emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller than the proposed project, but would not generate emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), NO_X, or particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller in excess of PCAPCD's thresholds. Under Alternative 1, construction noise would last for a longer period than under the proposed project, resulting in marginally greater impacts. Because Washington Boulevard would be reduced to a single lane of alternating northbound and southbound traffic from south of Diamond Oaks Road to beyond the railroad bridge for a distance of 1,400 feet, traffic delays during Alternative 1's 20-month construction period would correspond to an LOS F condition. In addition, congestion caused by queuing during LOS F conditions would result in significant ingress and egress delays for residents of Diamond K Estates, which has a single stop sign controlled point of access from Washington Boulevard at Kaseberg Drive. Because traffic would degrade to a LOS F condition, Alternative 1 construction activities would have a similar impact on traffic operations (LOS F compared with road closure and therefore no LOS) as the proposed project. There would be two notable differences. First, under the proposed project, one lane of through traffic would be maintained under controlled conditions, which would benefit local traffic. Second, LOS impacts of the proposed project along the temporary detour route would be reduced slightly under Alternative 1 because maintaining one lane of through traffic at the construction site would reduce detour route average daily traffic and related intersection LOS impacts.

The above tradeoffs between the proposed project and Alternative 1 were shared with the public during community outreach and workshops conducted prior to release of the Draft EIR. Because of the expedited construction scheduled and public support expressed for it, the proposed project includes the "full closure" construction approach.

Therefore, the City Council rejects Alternative 1 as set forth and evaluated in the EIR because the City finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, ***social***, technological, and other considerations described under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that make this alternative infeasible. In making this determination, the City Council is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." In this instance, the City Council defers to social input received during community outreach which favored a shorter construction schedule with slightly greater impacts over the marginal transportation benefits that might be achieved by maintaining one-lane controlled-traffic conditions during Phase 2 reconstruction of the Andora Underpass.

11.3.3 Alternatives Conclusion

As explained above, the City Council selects the proposed Project as set forth and fully evaluated in the Final EIR. The following Statement of Overriding Considerations applies to the selected project, which includes the temporary closure of Washington Boulevard during Phase 2 construction of the UPRR Andora Underpass.

12 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In determining whether to approve a project, CEQA requires all public agencies to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental impacts. The City Council approves the selected project despite the significant unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the EIR. The EIR consists of: the Draft EIR and appendices, the Draft EIR technical appendices, and the Final EIR and appendices.

The EIR determined that the selected project is expected to result in seven significant and unavoidable impacts as noted in Table 1 and discussed below.

12.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

The EIR identifies the following significant and unavoidable impacts for the selected project:

Aesthetics

- Impact AES-5: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Impact GHG-1: Generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment
- Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases

Noise

- Impact NOI-1: Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards
- Impact NOI-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels
- Impact NOI-4: Creation of a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity

Transportation/Traffic

- Impact TRA-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system

12.2 BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City Council of the City of Roseville adopts and makes the following statement of overriding considerations regarding the remaining significant unavoidable impacts of the selected project, as discussed above, and the anticipated economic, social, and other benefits of the project.

The City Council finds and determines that (1) the majority of the significant impacts of the selected project will be reduced to acceptable levels by implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in these findings (see Table 1 below); (2) the City Council's approval of the selected project will result in seven significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures into the project; and (3) there are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will

further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level the remaining significant environmental impact.

In light of the environmental, social, economic, and other considerations identified in the findings above, and the considerations set forth below related to this project, this City Council chooses to approve the selected project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the selected project substantially outweigh the project's significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

The following statements identify the reasons why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the selected project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts. The substantial evidence supporting the enumerated benefits of the project can be found in the preceding findings, which are herein incorporated by reference; in the project itself; and in the record of proceedings as defined above. The overriding consideration set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the selected project outweigh its significant adverse environmental effect and is an overriding consideration warranting approval.

12.2.1 Implementation of the City of Roseville Transportation System Capital Improvement Program and Bicycle Master Plan

The City of Roseville's Transportation System Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identifies various transportation improvements needed to accommodate future transportation demands on the City's roadway system consistent with planned growth within and outside the City. The CIP is periodically updated to respond to changing conditions and to assure the development of an adequate transportation system consistent with the City's Level of Service (LOS) Policy. The roadway improvements called for in the Washington Boulevard/Andora Bridge Improvement Project are consistent with the CIP and are necessary to ensure consistency with CIP LOS policy at City buildout.

The City's 2008 Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) provides the blueprint for development of over 28 miles of Class I trails in Roseville, including new Class I facilities along Washington Boulevard through the project area. The Washington Boulevard/Andora Bridge Improvement Project advances the BMP vision for Class 1 trail facilities through the project corridor and would result in a safe, comfortable, and convenient bicycle route in an area of the City with limited existing options for pedestrians and bicyclists.

12.2.2 Minimal Difference Between Proposed/Selected Project and Alternative 1: One Lane Closure

As discussed above in Section 11.3.2, the City Council prefers the Proposed Project over Alternative 1 because the EIR identifies minimal difference in overall environmental impact between the two. Furthermore, there is substantial evidence, including evidence of ***social*** considerations described under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that make this alternative infeasible. In this instance, the City Council defers to social input received during community outreach which favored a shorter construction schedule with slightly greater impacts over the marginal transportation benefits that might be achieved by maintaining one-lane controlled-traffic conditions during Phase 2 reconstruction of the Andora Underpass.

12.2.3 Conclusion

Having reduced many of the effects of the project by adopting all feasible mitigation measures and balancing the benefits of the project against the selected project's significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the City Council hereby determines that the specific overriding social, environmental, and economic benefits of the project set forth above outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse effects of the project on the environment. The City Council finds that the overriding considerations set forth above constitutes a separate and independent basis for finding that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and warrants approval of the selected project.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
4.1 Aesthetics			
Impact AES-1: Temporary visual impacts caused by construction activities	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AES-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	None required	NI	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AES-3: Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway	None required	NI	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AG-4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use	None required	NI	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AES-5: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	**Mitigation Measure AES-5.1: Minimize Fugitive Light from Portable Sources Used for Construction** At a minimum, the construction contractor will minimize project-related light and glare to the maximum extent feasible, given safety considerations. Color-corrected halide lights will be used. Portable lights will be operated at the lowest allowable wattage while meeting safety requirements and portable lighting will only be raised to a height required to adequately aluminate the work area. All construction lights will be directed downward toward work activities and away from the night sky and particularly residential areas, to the maximum extent possible. The number of nighttime lights used will be minimized to the greatest extent possible.	SU	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure AES-5.1 which has been required or incorporated into the project, would reduce impacts of fugitive light from portable sources associated with construction activities, but not to a less-than-significant level. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this temporarily significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable short-term construction-related aesthetic impact, per the Overriding Considerations described above.
4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AG-3: 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	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Government Code Section 51104[g])			
Impact AG-4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AG-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.3 Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1: 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	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1: Install Fencing and/or Flagging to Protect Sensitive Biological Resources** Prior to construction, the City's contractor will install high-visibility orange construction fencing and/or flagging, as appropriate, along the perimeter of the work area adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) (e.g., riparian vegetation, wetlands, streams, special-status species habitat, elderberry shrub, and active bird nests). The City will ensure that the final construction plans show the locations where fencing will be installed. The plans also will define the fencing installation procedure. The City or contractor (at the discretion of the City) will ensure that the fencing is maintained throughout the duration of the construction period. If the fencing is removed, damaged, or otherwise compromised during the construction period, construction activities will cease until the fencing is repaired or replaced. The project's special provisions package will provide clear language regarding acceptable fencing material and prohibited construction-related activities, vehicle operation, material and equipment storage, and other surface-disturbing activities within ESAs. All temporary fencing will be removed upon completion of construction. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2: Conduct Environmental Awareness Training for Construction Personnel** Before any work occurs within the project limits, including equipment staging, grading, and tree and/or vegetation removal (clear and grub), the City will retain a qualified biologist (familiar with the resources in the area) to conduct a mandatory contractor/worker environmental awareness	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures Bio-1.1 through 1.10, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by implementing measures to avoid, minimize and protect sensitive, or special status species during construction. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project implementation would result in the direct and indirect removal of sensitive species habitat and ground disturbance that could lead to water quality impacts. Significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	training for construction personnel. The awareness training will be provided to all construction personnel (contractors and subcontractors) prior to beginning construction to brief them on the need to avoid effects on sensitive biological resources adjacent to construction areas and the penalties for not complying with applicable state and federal laws and permit requirements. The biologist will inform all construction personnel about the life history and habitat requirements of special-status species with potential for occurrence onsite, the importance of maintaining habitat, and the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion or other authorizing document (e.g. letter of concurrence). The environmental training will also cover general restrictions and guidelines that must be followed by all construction personnel to reduce or avoid effects on sensitive biological resources during project construction. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.3: Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Periodic Monitoring during Construction in Sensitive Habitats** The City will retain a qualified biologist to conduct periodic site visits during construction activities that involve ground disturbance (e.g., vegetation removal, grading, excavation, shoofly track construction) within or adjacent to ESAs. The timing and frequency of this monitoring will be determined through coordination with the City or as determined by the project permits. The purpose of the monitoring is to ensure that measures identified in this report are properly implemented to avoid and minimize effects on sensitive biological resources and to ensure that the project complies with all applicable permit requirements and agency conditions of approval. The biologist will ensure that fencing around ESAs remains in place during construction and that no construction personnel, equipment, or runoff/sediment from the construction area enters ESAs. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.4: Protect Water Quality and Minimize Sedimentation Runoff in Wetlands and Non-Wetland Waters** The City will comply with all construction site BMPs specified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and any other permit conditions to minimize the introduction of construction-related contaminants and mobilization of sediment in wetlands and non-wetland waters in and adjacent to the project area. These BMPs will address soil stabilization, sediment control, wind erosion control, vehicle tracking control, non-		requiring the protection of environmentally sensitive areas that would not need to be disturbed, training construction workers on the site's environmental sensitivities, conducting pre-construction surveys for sensitive species, installing and maintaining water quality protection devices, compensating for direct impacts on vernal pool branchiopod habitat, installing no-disturbance buffers around elderberry shrups, conducting vegetation removal and modifying existing structures during the non-breading season. (Draft EIR pp. 3.4-34 through 3.4-45)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	stormwater management, and waste management practices. The BMPs will be based on the best conventional and best available technology. The City will obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB and a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW, which will contain BMPs and water quality measures to ensure the protection of water quality. These permit condition and BMPs will be implemented as part of the project. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.5: Compensate for Direct Impacts on Vernal Pool Branchiopod Habitat** The City will compensate for direct impacts on vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp (vernal pool branchiopod) habitat by purchasing the appropriate habitat credits at a USFWS-approved mitigation or conservation bank. The habitat impacts will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio (2 acres preserved for every 1 acre affected). Mitigation and conservation banks in Placer County that sell vernal pool branchiopod credits are Locust Road Mitigation Bank, Toad Hill Ranch Mitigation Bank, and Western Placer Schools Conservation Bank. Based on the current project design, the City will purchase 0.16 acre of mitigation credits to compensate for direct impacts on 0.08 acre of vernal pool branchiopod habitat. The mitigation ratio and associated acreage may be modified based on the Biological Opinion, which will dictate the ultimate compensation for this federally listed species. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.6: Install a No-Disturbance Buffer around the Elderberry Shrub** In conjunction with Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1, Install Fencing and/or Flagging to Protect Sensitive Biological Resources, the City will ensure that a minimum 4-foot-tall, temporary plastic mesh-type construction fence (Tensor Polygrid or equivalent) is installed between the work area and the elderberry shrub to be protected. In addition to the exclusion fencing, k-rail (concrete or plastic) will be installed between the elderberry shrub and the work area to protect this shrub from inadvertent damage during construction and removal of the shoofly track. The biologist shall monitor the installation of k-rail protection. This fencing is intended to prevent encroachment by construction vehicles and personnel. The exact location of the fencing and k-rail shall be determined by a qualified biologist, with the goal of protecting habitat for		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	valley elderberry longhorn beetle. The fencing shall be strung tightly on posts set at a maximum interval of 10 feet. The fencing shall be checked regularly and maintained until all construction is complete. This exclusion fencing shall be marked by a sign stating: *This is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment.* No construction activity, including grading, will be allowed until this condition is satisfied. The fencing and a note reflecting this condition will be shown on the construction plans and specifications. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.7: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Northern Western Pond Turtle and Exclude Turtles from the Work Area** To avoid and minimize impacts on northern western pond turtles, the City will retain a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey within 48 hours of disturbance in suitable aquatic and upland habitats. The survey objectives are to determine the presence or absence of pond turtles in the vicinity of the construction work area and to determine if additional monitoring for pond turtles is necessary during construction to avoid entrapment of pond turtles during installation of stream diversion materials. If possible, the survey will be timed to coincide with the time of day and year when turtles are most likely to be active (during the cooler part of the day from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. during spring, summer, and late summer). Prior to conducting presence/absence surveys, the biologist will locate the microhabitats for turtle basking (logs, rocks, and brush thickets) and determine a location to quietly observe turtles. The survey will include a 15-minute wait time after arriving on site to allow startled turtles to return to open basking areas. The survey will consist of a minimum 15-minute observation time per area where turtles could be observed. If turtles are observed during the preconstruction survey or at any time during construction and they cannot be avoided, they will be either hand-captured or trapped and then relocated outside the construction area to appropriate aquatic habitat by a biologist with a valid memorandum of understanding from CDFW and as determined during coordination with		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	CDFW. If an active turtle nest is found, the biologist will coordinate with CDFW to determine the appropriate avoidance measures. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8: Conduct Vegetation Removal during the Non-breeding Season and Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors** Where vegetation removal is required to construct project features, the City will conduct this activity during the nonbreeding season for migratory birds and raptors (generally between September 1 and February 28), to the extent feasible. If construction activities (including vegetation removal) cannot be confined to the nonbreeding season, the City will retain a qualified wildlife biologist with knowledge of the relevant species to conduct nesting surveys before the start of construction. The migratory bird and raptor nesting surveys will include a minimum of two separate surveys to look for active migratory bird and raptor nests. Surveys will include a search of all trees and shrubs that provide suitable nesting habitat in the construction area. In addition, a 500-foot area around the construction area will be surveyed for nesting raptors and a 50-foot area around the construction area will be surveyed for songbirds. One survey should occur within 14 days prior to construction and the second survey within 48 hours prior to the start of construction or vegetation removal. If no active nests are detected during these surveys, no additional measures are required. If an active nest is found in the survey area, a no-disturbance buffer will be established around the nest site to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest until the end of the breeding season (August 31) or until after a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged and moved out of the project area (this date varies by species). The extent of these buffers will be determined by the biologist in coordination with USFWS and CDFW, and will depend on the level of construction disturbance, line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. Suitable buffer distances may vary between species. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.9: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Roosting Bats and Implement Protection Measures** To obtain the highest likelihood of detection, the following preconstruction bat surveys will be conducted within and adjacent to the construction area		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	for each construction season. If the surveys determine that bats are roosting in the construction area, the City will implement the protective measures described below. • Conduct Preconstruction Tree Surveys Prior to tree removal or pruning, qualified biologists will examine trees to be removed or pruned for suitable bat roosting habitat. High-value habitat features (e.g., large tree cavities, basal hollows, loose or peeling bark, and larger snags,) will be identified, and the area around these features will be searched for bats and bat sign (e.g., guano, culled insect parts, and staining). All mature broadleaf trees should be considered potential habitat for solitary foliage-roosting bat species. If bat sign is detected, biologists will conduct evening visual emergence survey of the source habitat feature, from a half hour before sunset to 1–2 hours after sunset for a minimum of 2 nights during the season that construction would be taking place. Night-vision goggles and/or full-spectrum acoustic detectors will be used during emergence surveys to assist in species identification. All emergence surveys will be conducted during favorable weather conditions (calm nights with temperatures conducive to bat activity and no precipitation predicted). Survey methodology may be supplemented as new research identifies advanced survey techniques and equipment that would aid in bat detections. • Identify Protective Measures for Bats Using Trees If it is determined that bats are using trees within or adjacent to the construction area as roost sites, the City (or its designated contractor) will coordinate with CDFW to identify protective measures to avoid and minimize impacts on roosting bats based on the type of roost and timing of activities. These measures could include the following measures. o If feasible, tree removal and pruning of trees containing an active roost will be avoided between April 1 and September 15 (the maternity period) to avoid impacts on reproductively active females and dependent young.		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	○ If a maternity roost is located, whether solitary or colonial, that roost will remain undisturbed until September 15 or until a qualified biologist has determined that the roost is no longer active. ○ If avoidance of nonmaternity roost trees is not possible, tree removal or pruning will be monitored by a qualified biologist. Prior to removal or pruning, the tree will be gently shaken, and several minutes should pass before felling trees or pruning limbs to allow bats time to arouse and leave the tree. The tree then will be removed in pieces, rather than felling the entire tree. The biologists will search downed vegetation for dead and injured bats. The presence of dead or injured bats that are species of special concern will be reported to CDFW. • Conduct Preconstruction Surveys of Culverts Prior to any work to replace, extend, or remove culverts, a qualified biologist will inspect box and pipe culverts for the presence of roosting bats. The biologist will conduct a daytime inspection/survey of box culverts for bat sign or occupancy to determine whether the structure is being used as a roost. Biologists conducting daytime surveys will listen for audible bat calls and will use the naked eye, binoculars, telescoping inspection mirror, and a high-powered spotlight to inspect culverts, and mud nests if present, for bats. Surfaces and the ground around the culvert will be surveyed for bat sign, such as guano, staining, and prey remains. Pipe culverts will be inspected from the exterior using the methods listed. If no suitable features are found, and no bats or bat sign are present, then a preconstruction survey within 24 hours prior to construction will be conducted. If suitable features are found, and bats or bat sign are present, additional surveys may be conducted to determine how the culvert is used by bats (i.e., whether it is used as a night roost, maternity roost, migration stopover, or for hibernation). • Implement Protective Measures for Bats Using Culverts		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	To avoid disturbance, injury, or mortality of bats utilizing culverts for roosting, the City (or its contractor) will conduct all work on these structures during the day (to the extent possible and where appropriate). If this is not possible, portable lights will be used to illuminate the roosting areas prior to and after sunset to deter bats from roosting during nights when work will occur. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.10: Modify Existing Structures during the Non-Breeding Season for Structure-Nesting Migratory Birds or Implement Exclusion Measures to Deter Nesting** To avoid impacts on nesting swallows and other structure-nesting migratory birds that are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code, the City will modify existing structures after the conclusion of the bird nesting period (February 1 through August 31). Construction, modification, or disturbance of existing box culvert structures after the nesting period has concluded is strongly preferred; however, if this is not possible, the City will implement the following avoidance measures. • Prior to the start of each phase of construction, the City (or its contractor) will hire a qualified wildlife biologist to inspect any box culvert that would be modified or disturbed during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through February 1). If nests are found and are determined to be inactive (abandoned), they shall be removed. • After inactive nests are removed and prior to construction from February 1 to August 31, the undersides of the portion of the culvert to be modified or disturbed will be covered with a suitable exclusion material that will prevent birds from nesting (i.e., 0.5- to 0.75-inch mesh netting, plastic tarp, expandable foam sealant, or other suitable material safe for wildlife). All exclusion devices will be installed before February 1 and will be monitored throughout the breeding season (typically several times a week). The exclusion material will be anchored so that swallows cannot attach their nests to the structures through gaps in the net. • Exclusion devices for birds will be installed in a manner that does not entrap day- roosting bats.		

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	• As an alternative to installing exclusion materials on a culvert, the City may hire a qualified biologist or qualified wildlife management specialist to remove nests as the birds construct them and before any eggs are laid. Visits to the site would need to occur daily throughout the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) because swallows can complete a nest in a 24-hour period. • If exclusion material is not installed on structures prior to February 1 or manual removal of nests is not conducted daily, and migratory birds colonize a culvert, removal or modification to that portion of the culvert may not occur until after August 31, or until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged and the nest is no longer in use. • If appropriate steps are taken to prevent swallows from constructing new nests as described in the preceding measures, work can proceed at any time of the year.		
Impact BIO-2: 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	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1: Install Fencing and/or Flagging to Protect Sensitive Biological Resources** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2: Conduct Environmental Awareness Training for Construction Personnel** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.3: Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Periodic Monitoring during Construction in Sensitive Habitats** **Mitigation Measure BIO-2.1: Compensate for the Loss of Riparian Communities** To compensate for the total loss of approximately 1.73 acres of riparian communities, prior to commencement of each construction phase, the City will purchase credits at an approved mitigation bank to ensure no net loss of riparian habitat functions and values. The City will purchase credits at a 3:1 ratio, which would require purchasing a total of approximately 5.19 acres of riparian habitat credits from an approved mitigation bank. This ratio and acreage will be confirmed during the review of future engineering drawings for each project phase and may be modified during the CDFW Section 1602 permitting process (if actual increase or	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO-1.1 through 1.3, and BIO-2.1 which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by implementing measures to avoid, minimize and protect sensitive, or special status species during construction and by requiring compensation for direct loss of riparian habitat. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	decrease) which will dictate the ultimate compensation. The City will provide written evidence to the resource agencies that compensation has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits. The amount to be paid will be the fee that is in effect at the time the fee is paid.		**Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project implementation would result in the direct and indirect removal of riparian habitat and ground disturbance could lead to water quality impacts. Significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by requiring the protection of environmentally sensitive areas that would not need to be disturbed, training construction workers on the site's environmental sensitivities, conducting pre-construction surveys and installing and maintaining water quality protection devices. Permanent impacts to riparian habitat would be mitigated by purchase of riparian habitat mitigation credits from an agency approved mitigation bank. (Draft EIR pp. 3.4-45 through 3.4-47)
Impact BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands and non-wetland waters as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, streams etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1: Install Fencing and/or Flagging to Protect Sensitive Biological Resources** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2: Conduct Environmental Awareness Training for Construction Personnel** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.3: Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Periodic Monitoring during Construction in Sensitive Habitats** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.4: Protect Water Quality and Minimize Sedimentation Runoff in Wetlands and Non-Wetland Waters** **Mitigation Measure BIO-3.1: Avoid and Minimize Disturbance of Waters of the United States/Waters of the State** To the extent possible, the City will avoid and minimize impacts on waters of the United States and waters of the State by implementing the following	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO-1.1 through 1.4, and BIO-3.1 and 3.2 which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by implementing measures to avoid, minimize and protect sensitive, or special status species during construction and by requiring the minimization of impacts and compensation for any direct loss of waters of the U.S. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	measures. These measures will be incorporated into contract specifications and implemented by the construction contractor. Avoid construction activities in saturated or ponded natural wetlands and drainages during the wet season (spring and winter) to the maximum extent possible. Stabilize streams/drainages immediately upon completion of construction activities. Other waters of the United States will be restored in a manner that encourages vegetation to re-establish to its pre-project condition and reduces the effects of erosion on the drainage system. Remove any trees, shrubs, debris, or soils that are inadvertently deposited below the OHWM of streams/drainages in a manner that minimizes disturbance of the bed and bank. Complete all activities promptly to minimize their duration and resultant impacts. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3.2: Compensate for the Permanent Loss of Waters of the United States/Waters of the State** To compensate for the total (Phases 1 and 2) permanent loss of approximately 0.19 acre of waters of the United States and waters of the State, prior to each project phase and consistent with permit requirements the City will purchase credits at an approved mitigation bank to ensure no net loss of wetland functions and values. Mitigation banks with service areas for Placer County that sell credits that satisfy USACE wetland and USFWS requirements include Sacramento River Ranch Mitigation Bank, Locust Road Mitigation Bank, and Toad Hill Ranch Mitigation Bank. The wetland compensation ratio will be a minimum of 1:1 (1 acre of wetland habitat credit for every 1 acre of impact) to ensure no net loss of wetland habitat functions and values. The City will also implement the conditions and requirements of state and federal permits that will be obtained for the proposed project. The actual mitigation ratio and associated credit acreage may be modified based on USACE and RWQCB permitting which will dictate the ultimate compensation for permanent impacts to waters of the United States/waters of the State.		incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project implementation would result in the direct and indirect removal of waters of the U.S. and ground disturbance could lead to water quality impacts. Significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by requiring the protection of environmentally sensitive areas that would not need to be disturbed, training construction workers on the site's environmental sensitivities, conducting pre-construction surveys and installing and maintaining water quality protection devices. Permanent and indirect impacts to waters of the U.S. would be mitigated by purchase of riparian habitat mitigation credits from an agency approved mitigation bank to achieve no net loss consistent with agency requirements. (Draft EIR pp. 3.4-45 through 3.4-47)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact BIO-4: 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	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.4 Cultural and Tribal Resources			
Impact CUL-1: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact CUL-2: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2.1: Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Encountered During Ground-Disturbing Activities** If buried cultural resources such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, or building foundations, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop in that area and within a 100-foot radius of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop a response plan, with appropriate treatment measures, in consultation with the City, SHPO, and other appropriate agencies. Preservation in place shall be the preferred treatment method per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) (avoidance, open space, capping, easement). Data recovery of important information about the resource, research, or other actions determined during consultation, is allowed if it is the only feasible treatment method.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-2.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by stopping work if any resources are unearthed during construction, suspending all activities within 100 feet of the find and contacting the appropriate agencies. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding: Construction of the proposed project could result in the discovery of unknown subsurface resources. Significant impacts associated with the potential disturbance of unknown cultural or archeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by ensuring any finds are preserved, recorded and/or recovered as appropriate as determined by a qualified archaeologist. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-50 through 3.5-51)
Impact CUL-3: Disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries	**Mitigation Measure CUL-3.1: Implement appropriate treatment for discovery of human remains** In the event that human remains are discovered, all work will cease in the vicinity (minimum of 100 feet) of the find and the Placer County coroner will be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American in origin, the coroner will be responsible for notifying the NAHC, which will appoint a MLD (Public Resources Code Section 5097.99). The City and MLD will make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the dignified treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (14 CCR 15064.5[d]). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The MLD will have 48 hours after notification by the NAHC to make their recommendation (Public Resources Code Section 5097.98). If the MLD does not agree to the reburial method, the project will follow Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), which states, "The landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance."	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-3.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by contacting the MLD and appropriate agencies to determine appropriate treatment. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project could result in the discovery of unknown Native American remains. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by ensuring Native American burials/remains are treated with appropriate dignity and relocated

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			as necessary so as not to be subject to further subsurface disturbance as determined by a qualified archaeologist and the NLD. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-51 through 3.5-52)
Impact CUL-4: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.5 Geology and Soils			
Impact GEO-1: Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact GEO-2: Potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil	**Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1: Provide a System to Meet NPDES Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff Requirements** The City will prepare a post-construction stormwater management plan as a separate document to demonstrate how the integrated measures of each construction phase will satisfy NPDES requirements. The post-construction requirements of the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, are: • Infiltrate impervious surface runoff on-site from the post-construction 85th percentile 24-hour storm event. • Treatment of runoff that cannot be infiltrated on-site shall follow EPA guidance regarding green infrastructure to the extent feasible (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2008). • Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration equal to or greater than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, runoff from the entire project (consisting of all	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring development and implementation of a stormwater management plan per the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	existing, new, and/or replaced impervious surfaces) must be included in the treatment system design. • Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration of less than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, only runoff from the new, and/or replaced impervious surface must be included in the treatment system design.		significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project will require soil disturbance including grading and trenching which could result in water quality impacts. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by preparing and implementing a stormwater management plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.9-15 through 3.0-16)
Impact GEO-3: Placement of project-related facilities on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact GEO-4: Placement of project-related facilities on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property	**Mitigation Measure GEO-4.1: Prepare Soil Report or Geotechnical Investigation and Implement Recommendations** The City will ensure that a soil report or geotechnical investigation be prepared that identifies the locations of expansive soils on the site. The project design will include the recommendations of the studies, such as a soil replacement and lime treatment, to avoid the effects of excessive soil expansion and contract on pavements, sound walls, and project elements.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-4.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring preparation of a site-specific soil/geotechnical report and implementing report recommendations as part of project design and construction. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project will require appropriate foundation design and soil engineering to ensure structural integrity given the site contains expansive soils. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by preparing a soil/geotechnical report and implementing its recommendations. (Draft EIR, p. 3.6-11)
Impact GEO-5: Placement of facilities on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact GEO-6: Direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature	**Mitigation Measure GEO-6.1: Cease Work until Review Conducted by Qualified Paleontologist and Recommendations Implemented** Should any evidence of paleontological materials (e.g., fossils) be encountered during grading and excavation, work will be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the City will be immediately notified. At that time, the City will coordinate all necessary investigations of the site with a qualified paleontologist to assess the resource and provide proper management recommendations. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or data recovery excavations. The contractor will implement any measures deemed necessary by the paleontologist for the protection of paleontological resources.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure GEO-6.1 and GEO-6.2, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by stopping work if any paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, suspending all activities within 100 feet of the find, contacting the appropriate agencies, and educating construction workers on the types of fossils that can be encountered and their general appearance. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Mitigation Measure GEO-6.2: Prepare and Implement a Worker Education Program for those Involved with Earthwork A worker education program, prepared by a qualified professional paleontologist, will review applicable local, state, and federal ordinances, laws, and regulations pertaining to paleontological resources, the types of fossils that can be encountered and their general appearance, discuss site avoidance requirements and notification procedures to be followed in the event that unanticipated paleontological resource is found during construction, and discussion disciplinary and other actions that can be taken against persons violating such laws.		adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project could result in the discovery of unknown subsurface paleontological resources. Significant impacts associated with the potential disturbance of unknown paleontological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by ensuring any finds are preserved, recorded and/or recovered as appropriate as determined by a qualified paleontologist. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.6-12 through 3.6-13)
4.6 Greenhouse Gas			
Impact GHG-1: Generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	None available	SU	**Finding:** The project would increase VMT, resulting in a slight increase in GHG emission compared with no project conditions. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate,

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above.
Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases	None available	SU	**Finding:** The project would increase VMT, resulting in a slight increase in GHG emission compared with no project conditions. Because implementation of the project would increase GHG emissions relative to no project conditions, the project would be inconsistent with SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS, a significant impact. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this significant environmental impact.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above.
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1: Creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, including lead based paint, aerially deposited lead, traffic striping, and treated wood waste	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.1: Develop a Lead Abatement Plan** Any thermoplastic traffic striping, soils affected by lead, and painted concrete on the Andora Underpass to be removed for disposal, or other waste material from the painted portions of the bridge (e.g., sandblasting waste) must be handled and disposed of prior to demolition or significant renovation. The abatement plan will provide for a California-certified asbestos consultant and California Department of Health Services-certified lead project designer to prepare hazardous materials specifications for abatement of the LBP, ADL, and traffic striping. This specification should be the basis for selecting qualified contractors to perform the proposed lead abatement work. Abatement of hazardous materials will be completed prior to any work on structures and facilities. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.2: Perform Soil Testing and Appropriately Dispose of Soils Contaminated with ADL** Construction contract specifications will provide that if soils adjacent to the roadway are to be disturbed, the City or its contractors will conduct further investigations and screening for ADL to assess the extent of hazardous ADL concentrations within the project alignment along shoulder areas on both sides of Washington Boulevard, beyond the Andora Underpass. If soils contain ADL in excess of established thresholds, soils will be handled in a manner compliant with the City CUPA regulatory requirements and disposed of properly.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measures HAZ-1.1 and HAZ-1.2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by developing and implementing measures to address painted concrete and soils affected by lead and by testing potentially contaminated soils and properly disposing of any soils that test positive for contamination. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Project implementation would result in demolition of the existing Andora Bridge which includes lead based paint and removal of pavement and disturbance of soils that

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			contain ADL. Significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by requiring development and implementation of a lead abatement plan and soil testing program. Project construction would proceed according to the plan and any identified contaminated soils would be appropriately removed and disposed of. (Draft EIR pp. 3.8-11 through 3.8-13)
Impact HAZ-2: Creation of 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	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact HAZ-3: Emission of hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact HAZ-4: Placement of project-related facilities on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, and resulting creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact HAZ-5: Placement of project-related facilities within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact HAZ-6: Placement of project-related facilities in the vicinity of a private airstrip, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact HAZ-7: Impairment of implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact HAZ-8: Exposure of people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact WQ-1: Violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-2: Substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge	**Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1: Provide a System to Meet NPDES Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff Requirements**	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	The City will prepare a post-construction stormwater management plan as a separate document to demonstrate how the integrated measures of each construction phase will satisfy NPDES requirements. The post-construction requirements of the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, are: Infiltrate impervious surface runoff on-site from the post-construction 85th percentile 24-hour storm event. Treatment of runoff that cannot be infiltrated on-site shall follow EPA guidance regarding green infrastructure to the extent feasible (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2008). Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration equal to or greater than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, runoff from the entire project (consisting of all existing, new, and/or replaced impervious surfaces) must be included in the treatment system design. Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration of less than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, only runoff from the new, and/or replaced impervious surface must be included in the treatment system design.		development and implementation of a stormwater management plan per the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project will require soil disturbance including paving which could result in drainage pattern impacts. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by preparing and implementing a stormwater management plan that addresses the introduction of new impervious surfaces and requirements for stormwater treatment. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.9-15 through 3.0-16)
Impact WQ-3: Substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite	**Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1: Provide a System to Meet NPDES Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff Requirements** The City will prepare a post-construction stormwater management plan as a separate document to demonstrate how the integrated measures of each construction phase will satisfy NPDES requirements. The post-construction requirements of the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, are: Infiltrate impervious surface runoff on-site from the post-construction 85th percentile 24-hour storm event.	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring development and implementation of a stormwater management plan per the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit.

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Treatment of runoff that cannot be infiltrated on-site shall follow EPA guidance regarding green infrastructure to the extent feasible (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2008). Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration equal to or greater than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, runoff from the entire project (consisting of all existing, new, and/or replaced impervious surfaces) must be included in the treatment system design. Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration of less than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, only runoff from the new, and/or replaced impervious surface must be included in the treatment system design.		The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project will require soil disturbance including paving which could result in drainage pattern impacts. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by preparing and implementing a stormwater management plan that addresses the introduction of new impervious surfaces and requirements for stormwater treatment. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.9-16 through 3.0-17)
Impact WQ-4: Substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite	**Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1: Provide a System to Meet NPDES Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff Requirements** The City will prepare a post-construction stormwater management plan as a separate document to demonstrate how the integrated measures of each construction phase will satisfy NPDES requirements. The post-construction requirements of the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, are: Infiltrate impervious surface runoff on-site from the post-construction 85th percentile 24-hour storm event. Treatment of runoff that cannot be infiltrated on-site shall follow EPA guidance regarding green infrastructure to the extent feasible (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2008). Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration equal to or greater than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, runoff from the entire project (consisting of all existing, new, and/or	LTS	**Finding:** Compliance with Mitigation Measure WQ-2.1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring development and implementation of a stormwater management plan per the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which was prepared consistent with the State of California Phase II Small MS4 General Permit. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the potentially

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	replaced impervious surfaces) must be included in the treatment system design. Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration of less than 50% of the impervious surface of an existing street or road, only runoff from the new, and/or replaced impervious surface must be included in the treatment system design.		significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the proposed project will require soil disturbance including paving which could result in drainage pattern impacts. This impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by preparing and implementing a stormwater management plan that addresses the introduction of new impervious surfaces and requirements for stormwater treatment. (Draft EIR, p. 3.9-17)
Impact WQ-5: Creation of or contribution to runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-6: Other substantial degradation of water quality	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-7: Placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-8: Placement of structures that would impede or redirect floodflows within a 100-year flood hazard area	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002;

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-9: Exposure of people or structures to significant risk involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact WQ-10: Contribution to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.9 Land Use and Planning			
Impact LU-1: Physical division of an established community	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
4.10 Mineral Resources			
Impact MIN-1: Contribution to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact MIN-2: Contribution to 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	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.11 Noise			
Impact NOI-1: Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices** When possible, the use of noise-generating construction equipment will be avoided outside of exempt hours in the City of Roseville. When not possible, construction contractors will specify noise-reducing construction practices that will be employed to reduce construction noise from construction activities that would occur during non-exempt hours. Measures specified by the contractors will be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction activities. Measures that can be used to limit noise include, but are not limited to, those listed below. Locate construction equipment as far as feasible from noise-sensitive uses. Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that all equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. Do not idle inactive construction equipment for prolonged periods (i.e., more than 5 minutes). Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust systems.	SU	**Finding:** The project could require night work to complete the railroad shoefly installation and removal. Because this work could occur during nighttime hours and would not be exempt by ordinance, related noise impacts could be significant. Mitigation measure NOI-1.1 would minimize construction noise, however not to a less than significant level. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact to less than significant. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate,

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible.		avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.12-12 through 3.0-20)
Impact NOI-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	**Mitigation Measure NOI-2.1: Construction Vibration Control Measures** A construction vibration control plan will be prepared to reduce construction vibration levels at the adjacent residential land uses. The plan will require that the construction contractor conduct project construction such that groundborne vibration generated by construction is not readily perceptible at the adjacent residences (less than 0.04 PPV in/sec), where feasible. Measures specified by the contractors will be reviewed and approved by the City for feasibility prior to construction activities utilizing a pile driver or vibratory roller. Measures that can be employed to reduce vibration include: • Operating heavy equipment as far as practical from residential uses. • The use of smaller equipment or equipment that generates less vibration (e.g. using a non-vibratory roller in place of a vibratory roller) when construction activity must occur within approximately 80 feet of an existing residence. • Limiting pile-driving activity to the extent feasible, and implementing "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as predrilling piles or using sonic or vibratory pile drivers) to the extent possible.	SU	**Finding:** The project requires vibratory equipment for soil compaction and possibly for sheet pile driving at the Andora Bridge site. Construction vibration impacts related to annoyance at adjacent residences would be potentially significant impacts. Mitigation measure NOI-2.1 would minimize construction vibration impacts, however not to a less than significant level. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact to less than significant. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			significant level this significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable construction vibration impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.12-12 through 3.0-20)
Impact NOI-3: Generation of a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact NOI-4: Creation of a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices** When possible, the use of noise-generating construction equipment will be avoided outside of exempt hours in the City of Roseville. When not possible, construction contractors will specify noise-reducing construction practices that will be employed to reduce construction noise from construction activities that would occur during non-exempt hours. Measures specified by the contractors will be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction activities. Measures that can be used to limit noise include, but are not limited to, those listed below. Locate construction equipment as far as feasible from noise-sensitive uses. Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that all equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. Do not idle inactive construction equipment for prolonged periods (i.e., more than 5 minutes).	SU	**Finding:** The project could require night work to complete the railroad shoefly installation and removal. Because this work could occur during nighttime hours, would not be exempt by ordinance, and would generate a substantial temporary periodic increase, the noise impact is considered significant. Mitigation measure NOI-1.1 would minimize construction noise, however not to a less than significant level. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact to less than significant. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
	Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust systems. Ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible.		environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.12-12 through 3.0-20)
Impact NOI-5: Presence of project-related activities within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, resulting in exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact NOI-6: Presence of project-related activities in the vicinity of a private airstrip, resulting of exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
4.12 Population and Housing			
Impact POP-1: Creation of substantial population growth either directly or indirectly	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact POP-2: Displacement of a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact POP-3: Displacement of a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.13 Public Services			
Impact PS-1: Creation of a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.14 Recreation			
Impact REC-1: Increased use of existing recreational facilities, resulting in substantial physical deterioration	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact REC-2: Construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
4.15 Transportation/Traffic			
Impact TRA-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1.1: Modify Traffic Signal Timing at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Intersection by Shifting 6 Seconds of Green Light Time from the Northbound Left-Turn Movement to the Southbound Through Movement** This mitigation measure will reallocate green light time on the Washington Boulevard north/south approaches to better match travel demand. It will not alter green light time, splits, or offsets on the coordinated east/west Pleasant Grove Boulevard approaches. Table 3.16-9 shows that this mitigation will reduce the PM peak hour delay from 70 to 56 seconds per vehicle (see the transportation study in Appendix B). Although operations would technically remain in the LOS E range, the delay at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection would be within 1 second of LOS D, which is considered acceptable. Nonetheless, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	**Finding:** The proposed project would cause worsening of PM peak hour operations from LOS D to LOS E at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection which would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.1 would reduce this impact, however not to a less than significant level. No project level mitigation is available to reduce this impact to less than significant. The City Council, therefore, finds that there are no feasible changes or alterations that could be incorporated into the project to avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Explanation/Facts in Support of Finding:** There are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce to a less-than-significant level this significant environmental impact. This City Council chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, technological, and other benefits resulting from the project substantially outweigh the

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
			significant and unavoidable peak hour operation level of service impacts, per the Overriding Considerations described above. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.12-12 through 3.0-20)
Impact TRA-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact TRA-3: Potential to cause a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact TRA-4: Substantial increase in hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves, dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact TRA-5: Cause inadequate emergency access	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact TRA-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
4.16 Utility and Services Systems			
Impact UT-1: Exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact UT-2: Construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact UT-3: Construction of new stormwater drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact UT-4: Creation of a need for new or expanded entitlements or resources for sufficient water supply	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact UT-5: Project-related exceedance of existing wastewater treatment capacity	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact UT-6: Project-related exceedance of the relevant landfill's permitted capacity	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Table 1 Selected Project Impacts and Findings of Fact

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	Findings of Fact
Impact UT-7: Inconsistency with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste	None required	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (PRC Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)