

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Notice** is hereby given that, as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has prepared an Initial Study leading to a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project referenced below. This Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review and comment.

**Project Title/File#:** NCRSP PCL 40 – Skilled Nursing Facility; File #PL24-0109

**Project Address:** 250 Conference Center Drive, Roseville, CA, 95678 (APN 363-011-013-000)

**Project Applicant:** Cliff R Heeley, RangeComm

**Project Owner:** Romney White, 250 Conference Center, LLC

**Project Planner:** Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner

**Project Description:** The proposed project will subdivide the parcel into two lots, Parcel A and Parcel B, which will be approximately 3.63 acres and 4.25 acres, respectively. Parcel A will remain vacant, while Parcel B is proposed to be developed with a ±53,600-square-foot single-story, 120-bed skilled nursing facility, with associated parking, lighting and landscaping. The project entitlements include a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the lot and a Design Review Permit to review the site design and building architecture.

The project site is not identified on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5.

**Document Review and Availability:** The public review and comment period begins on **April 4, 2024** and ends on **April 24, 2024**. The Mitigated Negative Declaration may be reviewed online at: <https://www.roseville.ca.us/environmentaldocuments> (under Private Development Projects).

**Written comments on the adequacy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration may be submitted to Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner at [kshallow@roseville.ca.us](mailto:kshallow@roseville.ca.us) or in person at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 (Monday—Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.), and must be received no later than 5:00 pm on April 24, 2024.**

This project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the City's Design Committee. At this hearing, the Design Committee will consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated project entitlements. Separate notices will be published when the hearing is scheduled.

Mike Isom  
Development Services Director

Dated: April 2, 2024

Publish: April 4, 2024

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Project Title/File Number:** NCRSP PCL 40 – Skilled Nursing Facility; File #PL24-0109  
**Project Location:** 250 Conference Center Drive, Roseville, Placer County, CA 95678 (APN 363-011-013-000)  
**Project Applicant:** Cliff R Heeley, RangeComm; (704) 458-3366; 2025 Zumbahl Road #45, Saint Charles, MO 63303  
**Property Owner:** Romney White, 250 Conference Center, LLC; (925) 295-1340; 2605 Camino Tassajara #2408, Danville, CA 94526  
**Lead Agency Contact Person:** Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner - City of Roseville; (916) 746-1309  
**Date:** April 2, 2024

### Project Description:

The proposed project will subdivide the parcel into two lots, Parcel A and Parcel B, which will be approximately 3.63 acres and 4.25 acres, respectively. Parcel A will remain vacant, while Parcel B is proposed to be developed with a ±53,600-square-foot single-story, 120-bed skilled nursing facility, with associated parking, lighting and landscaping. The project entitlements include a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the lot and a Design Review Permit to review the site design and building architecture.

### DECLARATION

The Planning Manager has determined that the above project will not have significant effects on the environment and therefore does not require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The determination is based on the attached initial study and the following findings:

- A. *The project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.*
- B. *The project will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.*
- C. *The project will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.*
- D. *The project will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.*
- E. *No substantial evidence exists that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.*
- F. *The project incorporates all applicable mitigation measures identified in the attached initial study.*
- G. *This Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.*

---

## INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project Title/File Number:</b> | NCRSP PCL 40 – Skilled Nursing Facility; File #PL24-0109   |
| <b>Project Location:</b>          | 250 Conference Center Drive, Roseville, Placer County, CA 95678 (APN 363-011-013-000)  |
| <b>Project Description:</b>       | The proposed project will subdivide the parcel into two lots, Parcel A and Parcel B, which will be approximately 3.63 acres and 4.25 acres, respectively. Parcel A will remain vacant, while Parcel B is proposed to be developed with a ±53,600-square-foot single-story, 120-bed skilled nursing facility, with associated parking, lighting and landscaping. The project entitlements include a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the lot and a Design Review Permit to review the site design and building architecture. |
| <b>Project Applicant:</b>         | Cliff R Heeley, RangeComm  |
| <b>Property Owner:</b>            | Romney White, 250 Conference Center, LLC   |
| <b>Lead Agency Contact:</b>       | Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner; Phone (916) 746-1309   |

---

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above described project application. The document relies on site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. Where documents were submitted by consultants working for the applicant, City staff reviewed such documents in order to determine whether, based on their own professional judgment and expertise, staff found such documents to be credible and persuasive. Staff has only relied on documents that reflect their independent judgment, and has not accepted at face value representations made by consultants for the applicant.

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

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures to which the applicant agrees, the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

# Table of Contents


|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Project Description</b> .....  | <b>3</b>      |
| <b>City of Roseville Mitigation Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards</b> ..... | <b>4</b>      |
| <b>Other Environmental Documents Relied Upon</b> .....                          | <b>5</b>      |
| <b>Explanation of Initial Study Checklist</b> .....                             | <b>5</b>      |
| <br><b>Initial Study Checklist</b>  |               |
| <b>I. Aesthetics</b> .....  | <b>6</b>      |
| <b>II. Agricultural &amp; Forestry Resources</b> .....                          | <b>8</b>      |
| <b>III. Air Quality</b> .....   | <b>9</b>      |
| <b>IV. Biological Resources</b> .....   | <b>12</b>     |
| <b>V. Cultural Resources</b> .....  | <b>15</b>     |
| <b>VI. Energy</b> .....   | <b>17</b>     |
| <b>VII. Geology and Soils</b> .....   | <b>18</b>     |
| <b>VIII. Greenhouse Gases</b> .....   | <b>20</b>     |
| <b>IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b> .....                                | <b>22</b>     |
| <b>X. Hydrology and Water Quality</b> .....                                     | <b>25</b>     |
| <b>XI. Land Use and Planning</b> .....  | <b>28</b>     |
| <b>XII. Mineral Resources</b> .....   | <b>28</b>     |
| <b>XIII. Noise</b> .....  | <b>29</b>     |
| <b>XIV. Population and Housing</b> .....  | <b>31</b>     |
| <b>XV. Public Services</b> .....  | <b>32</b>     |
| <b>XVI. Recreation</b> .....  | <b>33</b>     |
| <b>XVII. Transportation</b> .....   | <b>34</b>     |
| <b>XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources</b> .....                                   | <b>36</b>     |
| <b>XIX. Utilities and Service Systems</b> .....                                 | <b>38</b>     |
| <b>XX. Wildfire</b> .....   | <b>40</b>     |
| <b>XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance</b> .....                            | <b>41</b>     |
| <br><b>Environmental Determination</b> .....                                    | <br><b>43</b> |
| <br><b>Attachments</b> .....  | <br><b>43</b> |

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### Project Location

The project site is located on Parcel 40 of the North Central Roseville Specific Plan (NCRSP) area (see Figure 1). The property is 7.87 acres and has an address of 250 Conference Center Drive (APN 363-011-013-000).

Figure 1: Project Site



### Background

The NCRSP encompasses approximately 2,330 acres and is situated between Washington Boulevard and Interstate 80. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared and certified for the NCRSP in May 1990 (State Clearinghouse #88053010). The EIR addressed the major cumulative impacts of developing the Specific Plan as a whole, including the subject property.

### Environmental Setting

The site is currently undeveloped and has a zoning designation of Community Commercial/Special Area-North Central (CC/SA-NC) and a General Plan land use designation of Business Professional/Community Commercial (BP/CC). The project has frontage on Conference Center Drive to the east. The site is disked annually and no natural features such as wetlands or native oak trees are present on the site. Table 1 below identifies the site and surrounding zoning and land use designations. Surrounding uses include VillaSport Athletic Club and an undeveloped BP/CC parcel to the north and northeast, Open Space to the east and south, and Hyatt Place Hotel to the southwest. The Open Space corridor, which is a tributary to the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, is also designated as Floodplain because the City's Regulatory Floodplain is located in the Open Space.

**Table 1: Site and Surrounding Zoning/Land Use**

| Location | Zoning   | General Plan Land Use                              | Actual Use of Property              |
|----------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Site     | Community Commercial/Special Area-North Central Roseville Specific Plan (CC/SA-NC) | Business Professional/Community Commercial (BP/CC) | Vacant                              |
| North    | CC/SA-NC   | BP/CC  | VillaSport Athletic Club and vacant |
| South    | Open Space (OS)  | Open Space/Floodplain (OS/FP)                      | Open Space                          |
| East     | CC/SA-NC and OS  | BP/CC and OS/FP                                    | Vacant and Open Space               |
| West     | CC/SA-NC   | BP/CC  | Hyatt Place Hotel                   |

**Proposed Project**

The proposed project will subdivide the parcel into two lots, Parcel A and Parcel B, which will be approximately 3.63 acres and 4.25 acres, respectively. Parcel A will remain vacant, while Parcel B is proposed to be developed with a ±53,600-square-foot single-story, 120-bed skilled nursing facility, with associated parking, lighting and landscaping. The project will consist of three buildings connected by breezeways and will feature outdoor courtyard and garden areas. The project includes a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the lot and a Design Review Permit to review the site design and building architecture. The resulting Parcel A will require separate approval of a Design Review Permit prior to development of the parcel. Skilled nursing is a principally permitted use in the CC zone district and is consistent with the BP/CC General Plan land use.

**CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATION ORDINANCES, GUIDELINES, AND STANDARDS**

For projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, CEQA Guidelines section 15183(f) allows a lead agency to rely on previously adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects, when the standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence, that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects, unless substantial new information shows otherwise (CEQA Guidelines §15183(f)). The City of Roseville adopted CEQA Implementing Procedures (Implementing Procedures) which are consistent with this CEQA Guidelines section. The current version of the Implementing Procedures were adopted in April 2008 (Resolution 08-172), along with Findings of Fact, and were updated in January 2021 (Resolution 21-018). The below regulations and ordinances were found to provide uniform mitigating policies and standards, and are applicable to development projects. The City’s Mitigating Policies and Standards are referenced, where applicable, in the Initial Study Checklist.

- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37 and as further amended)
- City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208 and as further amended)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation (Tribal Consultation Policy) (Resolution 20-294)

- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines
- Specific Plan Design Guidelines:
  - Development Guidelines Del Webb Specific Plan
  - Landscape Design Guidelines for North Central Roseville Specific Plan
  - North Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (Olympus Pointe) Signage Guidelines
  - North Roseville Area Design Guidelines
  - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines
  - Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines
  - Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - Highland Reserve North Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - West Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - Sierra Vista Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - Creekview Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
  - Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
- City of Roseville 2035 General Plan

## **OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON**

---

- 2035 General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report, certified August 5, 2020 (<https://www.roseville.ca.us/cms/one.aspx?portalId=7964922&pageId=8774544>)
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan (NCRSP) Environmental Impact Report, certified May 1990 (<https://www.roseville.ca.us/cms/One.aspx?portalId=7964922&pageId=8775118>)

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, any project which is consistent with the development densities established by zoning, a Community Plan, or a General Plan for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The 2035 General Plan Update EIR (General Plan EIR) updated all Citywide analyses, including for vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, water supply, water treatment, wastewater treatment, and waste disposal. The proposed project is consistent with the adopted land use designations examined within the environmental documents listed above, and thus this Initial Study focuses on effects particular to the specific project site, impacts which were not analyzed within the EIR, and impacts which may require revisiting due to substantial new information. When applicable, the topical sections within the Initial Study summarize the findings within the environmental documents listed above. The analysis, supporting technical materials, and findings of the environmental document are incorporated by reference, and are available for review at the Civic Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

## **EXPLANATION OF INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

---

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines recommend that lead agencies use an Initial Study Checklist to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The Initial Study Checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by this project. This section of the Initial Study incorporates a portion of Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines. Within each topical section (e.g. Air Quality) a description

of the setting is provided, followed by the checklist responses, thresholds used, and finally a discussion of each checklist answer.

There are four (4) possible answers to the Environmental Impacts Checklist on the following pages. Each possible answer is explained below:

- 1) A “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from the information that a fair argument based on substantial evidence can be made to support a conclusion that a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change may occur to any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. When one or more “Potentially significant Impact” entries are made, an EIR is required.
- 2) A “Less Than Significant With Mitigation” answer is appropriate when the lead agency incorporates mitigation measures to reduce an impact from “Potentially Significant” to “Less than Significant.” For example, floodwater impacts could be reduced from a potentially-significant level to a less-than-significant level by relocating a building to an area outside of the floodway. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are identified as MM followed by a number.
- 3) A “Less Than significant Impact” answer is appropriate if there is evidence that one or more environmental impacts may occur, but the impacts are determined to be less than significant, or the application of development policies and standards to the project will reduce the impact(s) to a less-than-significant level. For instance, the application of the City’s Improvement Standards reduces potential erosion impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- 4) A “No Impact” answer is appropriate where it can be demonstrated that the impact does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment. For instance, a project in the center of an urbanized area with no agricultural lands on or adjacent to the project area clearly would not have an adverse effect on agricultural resources or operations. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the Initial Study. Where a “No Impact” answer is adequately supported by the information sources cited in the Initial Study, further narrative explanation is not required. A “No Impact” answer is explained when it is based on project-specific factors as well as generous standards.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off- and on-site, indirect, direct, construction, and operation impacts, except as provided for under State CEQA Guidelines.

## **INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

---

### **I. Aesthetics**

The project is located in a typical urbanized setting within a commercially zoned area of the City. Public views of the site are from Conference Center Drive to the east and its adjacent sidewalks. Parcels immediately adjacent to the site to the north, east, and west have a land use of Business Professional/Community Commercial (BP/CC), while Open Space/Floodplain (OS/FP) is located to the east and south of the site.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of an environmental impact cannot always be determined through the use of a specific, quantifiable threshold. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b) affirms this by the statement “an ironclad definition of significant effect is not always possible because the significance of an activity may vary with the setting.” This is particularly true of aesthetic impacts. As an example, a proposed parking lot in a dense urban center would have markedly different visual effects than a parking lot in an open space area. For the purpose of this study, the significance thresholds are as stated in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, as shown in a–d of the checklist below. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Zoning Ordinance (e.g. building height, setbacks, etc), Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Ch. 18), Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347), and applicable Specific Plan Policies and/or Specific Plan Design Guidelines will prevent significant impacts in urban settings as it relates to items a, b, and c, below.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–b) There are no designated or eligible scenic vistas or scenic highways within or adjacent to the City of Roseville.

c) The project site is in an urban setting, and as a result lacks any prominent or high-quality natural features which could be negatively impacted by development. The City of Roseville has adopted Community Design Guidelines (CDG) for the purpose of creating building and community designs which are a visual asset to the community. The CDG includes guidelines for building design, site design and landscape design, which will result in a project that enhances the existing urban visual environment. Accordingly, the aesthetic impacts of the project are less than significant.

D) The project involves nighttime lighting to provide for the security and safety of project users. However, the project is already located within an urbanized setting with many existing lighting sources. Lighting is conditioned to comply with City standards (i.e. CDG) to limit the height of light standards and to require cut-off lenses and glare shields to minimize light and glare impacts. The project will not create a new source of substantial light. None of the project elements are highly reflective, and thus the project will not contribute to an increased source of glare.

**II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources**

The State Department of Conservation oversees the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which was established to document the location, quality, and quantity of agricultural lands, and the conversion of those lands over time. The primary land use classifications on the maps generated through this program are: Urban and Built Up Land, Grazing Land, Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland. According to the current California Department of Conservation Placer County Important Farmland Map (2012), the majority of the City of Roseville is designated as Urban and Built Up Land and most of the open space areas of the City are designated as Grazing Land. There are a few areas designated as Farmland of Local Importance and two small areas designated as Unique Farmland located on the western side of the City along Baseline Road. The current Williamson Act Contract map (2013/2014) produced by the Department of Conservation shows that there are no Williamson Act contracts within the City, and only one (on PFE Road) that is adjacent to the City. None of the land within the City is considered forest land by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland are called out as protected farmland categories within CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. Neither the City nor the State has adopted quantified significance thresholds related to impacts to protected farmland categories or to agricultural and forestry resources. For the purpose of this study, the significance thresholds are as stated in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, as shown in a–e of the checklist above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–e) The project site is not used for agricultural purposes, does not include agricultural zoning, is not within or adjacent to one of the areas of the City designated as a protected farmland category on the Placer County Important Farmland map, is not within or adjacent to land within a Williamson Act Contract, and is not considered forest land. Given the foregoing, the proposed project will have no impact on agricultural resources.

**III. Air Quality**

The City of Roseville, along with the south Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Non-Attainment Area. Under the Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a “serious non-attainment” area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, “non-attainment” for the state ozone standard, and a “non-attainment” area for the federal and state PM<sub>10</sub> standard (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Within Placer County, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for ensuring that emission standards are not violated. Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

In responding to checklist items a–c, project-related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. To assist in making this determination, the PCAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, which were developed by considering both the health-based ambient air quality standards and the attainment strategies outlined in the State Implementation Plan. The PCAPCD-recommended significance threshold for reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) is 82 pounds daily during construction and 55 pounds daily during operation, and for particulate matter (PM) is 82 pounds per day during both construction and operation. For all other constituents, significance is determined based on the concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) are also of public health concern, but no thresholds or standards are provided because they are considered to have no safe level of exposure. Analysis of TAC is based on the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook – A Community Health Perspective* (April 2005, California Air Resources Board), which lists TAC sources and recommended buffer distances from sensitive uses. For checklist item c, the PCAPCD’s *CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook)* recommends that the same thresholds used for the project analysis be used for the cumulative impact analysis.

With regard to checklist item d, there are no quantified significance thresholds for exposure to objectionable odors or other emissions. Significance is determined after taking into account multiple factors, including screening distances from odor sources (as found in the PCAPCD CEQA Handbook), the direction and frequency of prevailing winds, the time of day when emissions are detectable/present, and the nature and intensity of the emission source.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–c) Analyses are not included for sulfur dioxide, lead, and other constituents because there are no mass emission thresholds; these are concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards which require substantial, point-source emissions (e.g. refineries, concrete plants, etc.) before exceedance will occur, and the SVAB is in attainment for these constituents. Likewise, carbon monoxide is not

analyzed because the SVAB is in attainment for this constituent, and it requires high localized concentrations (called carbon monoxide “hot spots”) before the ambient air quality standard would be exceeded. “Hot spots” are typically associated with heavy traffic congestion occurring at high-volume roadway intersections. The General Plan EIR analysis of Citywide traffic indicated that more than 70% of signalized intersections would operate at level of service C or better—that is, they will not experience heavy traffic congestion. It further indicated that analyses of existing CO concentrations at the most congested intersections in Roseville show that CO levels are well below federal and state ambient air quality standards. The discussions below focus on emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, or PM. A project-level analysis has been prepared to determine whether the project will, on a singular level, exceed the established thresholds.

PCAPCD recommends that lead agencies use the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) to quantify a project’s construction and operational emissions for criterial air pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and PM). The results are then compared to the significance thresholds established by the district, as detailed above. The proposed project’s emissions were modeled using CalEEMod (version 2022.1). The CalEEMod was run using the model defaults as well as project specific information such as land use, lot acreage, number of beds, building square footage, and landscape area. The results are included as Attachment 1 and are summarized in Table 2 below. The modeled emissions for the project do not exceed the construction and operational thresholds of significance. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact related to construction or operational emissions. Impacts are less than significant.

**Table 2: CalEEMod Results**

| Pollutant              | Project Emissions (lbs/day) | Significance Threshold (lbs/day) | Exceeds Threshold? |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Construction Emissions |                             |                                  |                    |
| ROG                    | 23.5                        | 82                               | No                 |
| NO <sub>x</sub>        | 31.1                        | 82                               | No                 |
| PM <sub>10</sub>       | 21.2                        | 82                               | No                 |
| Operational Emissions  |                             |                                  |                    |
| ROG                    | 3360                        | 55                               | No                 |
| NO <sub>x</sub>        | 1.99                        | 55                               | No                 |
| PM <sub>10</sub>       | 2.55                        | 82                               | No                 |

The proposed project would not exceed the applicable thresholds of significance for air pollutant emissions during construction or operation. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (which is the SIP) or contribute substantially to the PCAPCD’s nonattainment status for ozone. In addition, because the proposed project would not produce substantial emissions of criteria air pollutants, CO, or TACs, adjacent residents would not be exposed to significant levels of pollutant concentrations during construction or operation. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts, and consistent with the analysis methodology outlined in the Significance Thresholds and Regulatory Setting section, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

With regard to TAC, there are hundreds of constituents which are considered toxic, but they are typically generated by stationary sources like gas stations, facilities using solvents, and heavy industrial operations. The proposed project is not a TAC-generating use, nor is it within the specified buffer area of a TAC-generating use, as established in the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook – A Community Health Perspective*. Impacts due to substantial pollutant concentrations are less than significant.

e) Diesel fumes from construction equipment and delivery trucks are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is temporary and diesel emissions are minimal and regulated. Typical urban projects such as residences and retail businesses generally do not result in substantial objectionable odors when operated in compliance with City Ordinances (e.g. proper trash disposal and storage). The Project is a typical urban development that lacks any characteristics that would cause the generation of substantial unpleasant odors. Thus, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. A review of the project surroundings indicates that there are no substantial odor-generating uses near the project site; the project location meets the recommended screening distances from odor-generators provided by the PCAPCD. Impacts related to odors are less than significant.

**IV. Biological Resources**

The site is currently vacant and primarily supports non-native grasses. As described in the Environmental Setting, the site is disked annually and there are no natural features such as wetlands or native oak trees present on the site. The parcel is adjacent to an open space corridor that contains a tributary to the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?       |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

There is no ironclad definition of significance as it relates to biological resources. Thus, the significance of impacts to biological resources is defined by the use of expert judgment supported by facts, and relies on the policies, codes, and regulations adopted by the City and by regulatory agencies which relate to biological resources (as cited and described in the Discussion of Checklist Answers section). Thresholds for assessing the significance of environmental impacts are based on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–f, above. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15065, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if:

The project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; [or] substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species . . .

Various agencies regulate impacts to the habitats and animals addressed by the CEQA Guidelines checklist. These include the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration–

Fisheries, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The primary regulations affecting biological resources are described in the sections below.

Checklist item a addresses impacts to special status species. A “special status” species is one which has been identified as having relative scarcity and/or declining populations. Special status species include those formally listed as threatened or endangered, those proposed for formal listing, candidates for federal listing, and those classified as species of special concern. Also included are those species considered to be “fully protected” by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (California Fish and Wildlife), those granted “special animal” status for tracking and monitoring purposes, and those plant species considered to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). The primary regulatory protections for special status species are within the Federal Endangered Species Act, California Endangered Species Act, California Fish and Game Code, and the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Checklist item b addresses all “sensitive natural communities” and riparian (14nundatio) habitat that may be affected by local, state, or federal regulations/policies while checklist item c focuses specifically on one type of such a community: protected wetlands. Focusing first on wetlands, the 1987 Army Corps Wetlands Delineation Manual is used to determine whether an area meets the technical criteria for a wetland. A delineation verification by the Army Corps verifies the size and condition of the wetlands and other waters in question, and determines the extent of government jurisdiction as it relates to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act and Section 401 of the State Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act protects all “navigable waters”, which are defined as traditional navigable waters that are or were used for commerce, or may be used for interstate commerce; tributaries of covered waters; and wetlands adjacent to covered waters, including tributaries. Non-navigable waters are called isolated wetlands, and are not subject to either the Federal or State Clean Water Act. Thus, isolated wetlands are not subject to federal wetland protection regulations. However, in addition to the Clean Water Act, the State also has jurisdiction over impacts to surface waters through the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne), which does not require that waters be “navigable”. For this reason, isolated wetlands are regulated by the State of California pursuant to Porter-Cologne. The City of Roseville General Plan also provides protection for wetlands, including isolated wetlands, pursuant to the General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. Federal, State and City regulations/policies all seek to achieve no net loss of wetland acreage, values, or function.

Aside from wetlands, checklist item b also addresses other “sensitive natural communities” and riparian habitat, which includes any habitats protected by local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The City of Roseville General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element includes policies for the protection of riparian areas and floodplain areas; these are Vegetation and Wildlife section Policies 2 and 3. Policy 4 also directs preservation of additional area around stream corridors and floodplain if there is sensitive woodland, grassland, or other habitat which could be made part of a contiguous open space area. Other than wetlands, which were already discussed, US Fish and Wildlife and California Department of Fish and Wildlife habitat protections generally result from species protections, and are thus addressed via checklist item a.

For checklist item d, there are no regulations specific to the protection of migratory corridors. This item is addressed by an analysis of the habitats present in the vicinity and analyzing the probable effects on access to those habitats which will result from a project.

The City of Roseville Tree Preservation ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66) requires protection of native oak trees, and compensation for oak tree removal. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City of Roseville Tree Preservation ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66) will prevent significant impacts related to loss of native oak trees, referenced by item e, above.

Regarding checklist item f, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans within the City of Roseville.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-c) The NCRSP EIR evaluated the biological resources in the plan area and anticipated development of the project site. There are no new or more severe impacts which would occur as a result of the project. No sensitive or special status species are known to exist on the site, nor are there wetlands or trees present on the site. The grassland was identified as having a limited value to wildlife within the plan area and conservation areas for grasslands of higher value have already been preserved. Although the site lacks habitat, there are trees adjacent to the site in the open space to the east that may provide suitable habitat for nesting raptors. Impacts to special status plant and animal species were evaluated in the NCRSP EIR and mitigation measures for potential impacts to nesting raptors were incorporated into the plan (NCRSP Chapter 8, MIT# 3.04-06 and 3.04-34). Consistent with the required measures in the NCRSP, a spring raptor nest survey will be required prior to commencement of construction activity. As this is a requirement of the specific plan, no mitigation is required. Compliance with these measures will ensure that impacts to special status species remain less than significant.

D) The City includes an interconnected network of open space corridors and preserves located throughout the City, to ensure that the movement of wildlife is not substantially impeded as the City develops. The development of the project site will not negatively impact these existing and planned open space corridors, nor is the project site located in an area that has been designated by the City, United States Fish and Wildlife, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife as vital or important for the movement of wildlife or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) No oak trees will be removed as a part of the proposed project, and no other conflicts with City policy adopted for the purpose of mitigating environmental effects have been identified. There is no impact with respect to this criterion.

f) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans; Natural Community Conservation Plans; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site.

**V. Cultural Resources**

As described within the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the Roseville region was within the territory of the Nisenan (also Southern Maidu or Valley Maidu). Two large permanent Nisenan habitation sites have been identified and protected within the City’s open space (in Maidu Park). Numerous smaller cultural resources, such as midden deposits and bedrock mortars, have also been recorded in the City. The gold rush which began in 1848 marked another settlement period, and evidence of Roseville’s ranching and mining past are still found today. Historic features include rock walls, ditches, low terraces, and other remnants of settlement and activity. A majority of documented sites within the City are located in areas designated for open space uses.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource pursuant to in Section 15064.5? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?                              |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts to cultural resources is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. The Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources section of the City of Roseville General Plan also directs the proper evaluation of and, when feasible, protection of significant resources (Policies 1 and 2). There are also various federal and State regulations regarding the treatment and protection of cultural resources, including the National Historic Preservation Act and the Antiquities Act (which regulate items of significance in history), Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code (which regulates the treatment of human remains) and Section 21073 et seq. of the California Public Resources Code (regarding Tribal Cultural Resources). The CEQA Guidelines also contains specific sections, other than the checklist items, related to the treatment of effects on historic resources.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2 (a), (b), and (c)). A *historical resource* is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Section 21084.1); a resource included in a local register of historical resources (Section 15064.5(a)(2)); or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant (Section 15064.5 (a)(3)). Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 requires evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing on the CRHR.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–b and d) No cultural resources are known to exist on the project site per the NCRSP EIR; however, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to cultural resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NCRSP EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

c) No paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site per the NCRSP EIR; however, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to such resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NCRSP EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

**VI. Energy**

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy inefficiency?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

Established in 2002, California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) currently requires that 33 percent of electricity retail sales be served by renewable energy resources by 2020, and 50 percent by 2030. The City published a Renewables Portfolio Standard Procurement Plan in June 2018, and continues to comply with the RPS reporting and requirements and standards. There are no numeric significance thresholds to define “wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary” energy consumption, and therefore significance is based on CEQA Guidelines checklist items a and b, above, and by the use of expert judgment supported by facts, relying on the policies, codes, and regulations adopted by the City and by regulatory agencies which relate to energy. The analysis considers compliance with regulations and standards, project design as it relates to energy use (including transportation energy), whether the project will result in a substantial unplanned demand on the City’s energy resources, and whether the project will impede the ability of the City to meet the RPS standards.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a & b) CalEEMod was used to estimate the electricity use for the proposed project. The estimated annual electricity use is 578,531 kilowatt hours (kWh). The project would consume energy both during project construction and during project operation.

During construction, fossil fuels, electricity, and natural gas would be used by construction vehicles and equipment. However, the energy consumed during construction would be temporary, and would not represent a significant demand on available resources. There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment or methods that would be less energy-efficient or which would be wasteful.

The completed project would consume energy related to building operation, exterior lighting, landscape irrigation and maintenance, and vehicle trips to and from the use. In accordance with California Energy Code Title 24, the project would be required to meet the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. This includes standards for water and space heating and cooling equipment; insulation for doors, pipes, walls, and ceilings; and appliances, to name a few. The project would also be eligible for rebates and other financial incentives from both the electric and gas providers for the purchase of energy-efficient appliances and systems, which would further reduce the operational energy demand of the project. The project was distributed to both PG&E and Roseville Electric for comments, and was found to conform to the standards of both providers; energy supplies are available to serve the project.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2035 General Plan Update included an assessment of energy impacts for the entire plan area. The analysis included consideration of transportation energy, and evaluated walkability, alternative transportation modes, and the degree to which the mix and location of uses would reduce vehicle miles traveled in the plan area. The EIR also included a citywide assessment of energy demand based on the existing and proposed land uses within the City. Impacts related to energy consumption were found to be less than significant. The project is consistent with the existing land use designation, and therefore is consistent with the current citywide assessment of energy demand, and will not result in substantial unplanned, inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy; impacts are less than significant.

**VII. Geology and Soils**

As described in the Safety Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, there are three inactive faults (Volcano Hill, Linda Creek, and an unnamed fault) in the vicinity, but there are no known active seismic faults within Placer County. The last seismic event recorded in the South Placer area occurred in 1908, and is estimated to have been at least a 4.0 on the Richter Scale. Due to the geographic location and soil characteristics within the City, the General Plan indicates that soil liquefaction, landslides, and subsidence are not a significant risk in the area.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| i) Ruptures of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.) |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| iv) Landslides?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to geology and soils is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–f listed above. Regulations applicable to this topic include the Alquist-Priolo Act, which addresses earthquake safety in building permits, and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, which requires the state to gather and publish data on the location and risk of seismic faults. The Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources section of the City of Roseville General Plan also directs the proper evaluation of and, when feasible, protection of significant archeological resources, which for this evaluation will include paleontological resources (Policies 1 and 2). Section 50987.5 of the California Public Code Section is only applicable to public land; this section prohibits the excavation, removal, destruction, or defacement/injury to any vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints or other paleontological feature.

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80) and Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to checklist item b. The Ordinance and standards include permit requirements for construction and development in erosion-prone areas and ensure that grading activities will not result in significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The use of septic tanks or alternative waste systems is not permitted in the City of Roseville, and therefore no analysis of criterion e is necessary.

## Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides.

–iii) According to United States Geological Service mapping and literature, active faults are largely considered to be those which have had movement within the last 10,000 years (within the Holocene or Historic time periods)<sup>1</sup> and there are no major active faults in Placer County. The California Geological Survey has prepared a map of the state which shows the earthquake shaking potential of areas throughout California based primarily on an area's distance from known active faults. The map shows that the City lies in a relatively low-intensity ground-shaking zone. Commercial, institutional, and residential buildings as well as all related infrastructure are required, in conformance with Chapter 16, *Structural Design Requirements*, Division IV, *Earthquake Design* of the California Building Code, to lessen the exposure to potentially damaging vibrations through seismic-resistant design. In compliance with the Code, all structures in the Project area would be well-built to withstand ground shaking from possible earthquakes in the region; impacts are less than significant.

iv) Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. The existing and proposed slopes of the project site are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, measures would be incorporated during construction to shore minor slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are less than significant.

b) Grading activities will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over-covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). Grading activities for the project will be limited to the project site. Grading activities require a grading permit from the Engineering Division. The grading permit is reviewed for compliance with the City's Improvement Standards, including the provision of proper drainage, appropriate dust control, and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures will be incorporated into the required grading plans and improvement plans. Therefore, the impacts associated with disruption, displacement, and compaction of soils associated with the project are less than significant.

C, d) A review of the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Placer County, accessed via the Web Soil Survey (<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>), indicates that the soils on the site are Exchequer very stony loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes, which are not listed as geologically unstable or sensitive. Therefore, the project has no impacts related to this criteria.

f) No paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site per the NCRSP EIR; however, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to such resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NCRSP EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

## VIII. Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth's atmosphere. The principal greenhouse gases (GHGs) that enter the atmosphere because of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and fluorinated gases. As explained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency<sup>2</sup>, global average temperature has increased by more than 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit since the late 1800s, and most of the warming of the past half century has been caused by human emissions. The City has taken proactive steps to reduce

<sup>1</sup> United States Geological Survey, <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=active%20fault>, Accessed January 2016

<sup>2</sup> <http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/overview.html>, Accessed January 2016

greenhouse gas emissions, which include the introduction of General Plan policies to reduce emissions, changes to City operations, and climate action initiatives.

Would the project:

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

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

In Assembly Bill 32 (the California Global Warming Solutions Act), signed by Governor Schwarzenegger of California in September 2006, the legislature found that climate change resulting from global warming was a threat to California, and directed that “the State Air Resources Board design emissions reduction measures to meet the statewide emissions limits for greenhouse gases . . .”. The target established in AB 32 was to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. CARB subsequently prepared the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) for California, which was approved in 2008. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions, and has been updated twice.

The current 2017 Scoping Plan updated the target year from 2020 to 2030, based on the targets established in Senate Bill 32 (SB 32). SB 32 was signed by the Governor on September 8, 2016, to establish a reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Critically, the 2017 Scoping Plan also sets the path toward compliance with the 2050 target embodied within Executive Order S-3-05 as well. According to the 2017 Scoping Plan the statewide 2030 target is 260 million metric tons. The Scoping Plan recommends an efficiency target approach for local governments for 2030 and 2050 target years.

The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) recommends that thresholds of significance for GHG be related to statewide reduction goals and has adopted thresholds of significance which take into account the 2030 reduction target. The thresholds include a de minimis and a bright-line maximum threshold, as well as residential and non-residential efficiency thresholds. However, the City developed its own thresholds as part of the 2035 General Plan Update project approved in July 2020. The justification for the City’s thresholds is contained within the General Plan EIR. The thresholds were developed based on statewide emissions data adjusted for relevant local conditions and land uses. The significance thresholds are shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: GHG Significance Thresholds**

|  | 2020 | 2030 | 2035 | 2050 |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| Per Capita Emissions Efficiency Targets (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/capita/yr) | 7.21 | 4.00 | 3.22 | 1.19 |

|   |      |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| Per Service Population Emissions Efficiency Targets (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/SP/yr)  | 5.07 | 2.79 | 2.25 | 0.83 |
| Projects which use these thresholds for environmental analysis should include a brief justification of the type of efficiency target and the target year selected. Per capita is most applicable to projects which only include residential uses, or in cases where reliable data to generate a service population estimate is unavailable. Projects should generally use the 2035 target year. Note that future projects consistent with the General Plan will not require further analysis, per the tiering provisions of CEQA. |      |      |      |      |
| Note: MMT CO <sub>2</sub> e = million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent; Service Population (SP) = population + employment   |      |      |      |      |

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–b) Per the tiering provisions of CEQA, and as explicitly stated within the City’s adopted GHG significance thresholds in Table 3 (above), a project which is consistent with the General Plan is not required to provide further analysis. The project is consistent with the General Plan, and therefore does not require greenhouse gas analysis. The consistency of the project with the General Plan EIR analysis is described below. Greenhouse gases are primarily emitted as a result of vehicle operation associated with trips to and from a project, and energy consumption from operation of the buildings.

Greenhouse gases from vehicles is assessed based on the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) resulting from a project, on a Citywide basis. Residential projects, destination centers (such as a regional mall), and major employers tend to increase VMT in a study area, either by adding new residents traveling in an area, or by encouraging longer trip lengths and drawing in trips from a broader regional area. However, non-residential projects and neighborhood-serving uses (e.g. neighborhood parks) tend to lower VMT in a study area because they do not generate new trips within the study area, they divert existing trips. These trips are diverted because the new use location is closer to home, on their way to another destination (e.g. work), or is otherwise more convenient.

The project proposes construction of an approximate 53,600-square-foot skilled nursing facility. As discussed in the Transportation section of this Initial Study, the project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and will not create additional trips that have not already been evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

The City’s General Plan Update (GPU) EIR included an analysis of GHG emissions, which would result from buildout of the City’s General Plan. The EIR concluded that General Plan build out would exceed the City’s threshold of 2.25 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population and that the affect was cumulatively considerable. Although mitigation measures were adopted as part of the General Plan, those measures would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels and impacts were considered significant and unavoidable. The proposed project is consistent with the land use assumptions in the GPU EIR and does not require further analysis per the tiering provisions of CEQA. The project includes reasonable and feasible design measures to reduce emissions, including implementation of the latest Cal-Green and energy efficiency code requirements. The project complies with General Plan policy related to GHG and the project does not result in any new GHG impacts not previously analyzed in the GPU EIR; therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Thus, project-generated GHG emissions would not conflict with and are consistent with statewide goals for greenhouse gas emissions reduction. This impact is considered less than significant.

**IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

There are no hazardous cleanup sites of record within 1,000 feet of the site according to both the State Water Resources Control Envirostor database (<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor database (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>). The project is not located on a site where existing hazardous materials have been identified, and the project does not have the potential

to expose individuals to hazardous materials. Asbestos and lead, which can be present in older buildings, are not onsite as the site is currently undeveloped.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?             |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| g) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to hazardous materials is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–g listed above. A material is defined as hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state or local regulatory agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. The determination of significance based on the above criteria depends on the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people who might be exposed to the health hazard, and the degree to which Project design or existing regulations would reduce the frequency of or severity of exposure. As an example, products commonly used for household cleaning are classified as hazardous when transported in large quantities, but one would not conclude that the presence of small quantities of household cleaners at a home would pose a risk to a school located within ¼-mile.

Many federal and State agencies regulate hazards and hazardous substances, including the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board), and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA). The state has been granted primacy (primary responsibility for oversight) by the US EPA to administer and enforce hazardous waste management programs. State regulations also have detailed planning and management requirements to ensure that hazardous materials are handled, stored, and disposed of properly to reduce human health risks. California regulations pertaining to hazardous waste management are published in the California Code of Regulations (see 8 CCR, 22 CCR, and 23 CCR).

The project is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private use airport. Therefore, no further discussion is provided for item e.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a, b) Standard construction activities would require the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, lubricants, glues, paints and paint thinners, soaps, bleach, and solvents. These are common household and commercial materials routinely used by both businesses and average members of the public. The materials only pose a hazard if they are improperly used, stored, or transported either through upset conditions (e.g. a vehicle accident) or mishandling. In addition to construction use, the operational project would result in the use of common hazardous materials as well, including bleach, solvents, and herbicides. Regulations pertaining to the transport of materials are codified in 49 Code of Federal Regulations 171–180, and transport regulations are enforced and monitored by the California Department of Transportation and by the California Highway Patrol. Specifications for storage on a construction site are contained in various regulations and codes, including the California Code of Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and the California Health and Safety Code. These same codes require that all hazardous materials be used and stored in the manner specified on the material packaging.

Existing regulations and programs are sufficient to ensure that potential impacts as a result of the use or storage of hazardous materials are reduced to less than significant levels.

c) See response to Items (a) and (b) above. While development of the site will result in the use, handling, and transport of materials deemed to be hazardous, the materials in question are commonly used in both residential and commercial applications, and include materials such as bleach and herbicides. The project will not result in the use of any acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

d) The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5<sup>3</sup>; therefore, no impact will occur.

e) This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services and development of the site has been anticipated and incorporated into emergency response plans. As such, the project will cause a less than significant impact to the City’s Emergency Response or Management Plans. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with all local, State and federal requirements for the handling of hazardous materials, which will ensure less-than-significant impacts. These will require the following programs:

- A Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) is required of uses that handle toxic and/or hazardous materials in quantities regulated by the California Health and Safety Code and/or the City.
- Businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials are required to complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) pursuant to local, State, or federal requirements.

g) The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the state agency responsible for wildland fire protection and management. As part of that task, CAL FIRE maintains maps designating Wildland Fire Hazard Severity zones. The City is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and is not in a CAL FIRE responsibility area; fire suppression is entirely within local responsibility. The project site is in an urban area, and therefore would not expose people to any risk from wildland fire. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

**X. Hydrology and Water Quality**

As described in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the City is located within the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin and the Dry Creek Basin. Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries drain most of the western and central areas of the City and Dry Creek and its tributaries drain the remainder of the City. Most major stream areas in the City are located within designated open space.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm>

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?                                  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site;  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or                                      |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| iv) impede or redirect flood flows?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| e) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiches zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

### Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to hydrology and water quality is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. For checklist item a, c (i), d, and e, the Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107), Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch. 14.20), and Stormwater Quality Design Manual (Resolution 16-152) will prevent significant impacts related to water quality or erosion. The standards require preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan for construction activities and includes designs to control pollutants within post-construction urban water runoff. Likewise, it is indicated that the Drainage Fees for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Watersheds (RMC Ch.4.48) and City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to checklist items c (ii) and c (iii). The ordinance and standards require the collection of drainage fees to fund improvements that mitigate potential flooding impacts, and require the design of a water drainage system that will adequately convey anticipated stormwater flows without increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff. These same ordinances and standards prevent impacts related to groundwater (items a and d), because developers are required to treat and detain all stormwater onsite using stormwater swales and other methods which slow flows and preserve infiltration. Finally, it is indicated that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch. 9.80) will prevent significant impacts related to items c (iv) and e. The Ordinance includes standard requirements for all new construction, including regulation of development with the potential to impede or redirect flood flows, and prohibits development within flood hazard areas. Impacts from tsunamis and seiches were screened out of the analysis (item e) because the project is not located near a water body or other feature that would pose a risk of such an event.

### Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,c (i),d, e) The project will involve the disturbance of on-site soils and the construction of impervious surfaces, such as asphalt paving and buildings. Disturbing the soil can allow sediment to be mobilized by rain or wind, and cause displacement into waterways. To address this and other issues, the developer is required to receive approval of a grading permit and/or improvement plants prior to the start of construction. The permit or plans are required to incorporate mitigation measures for dust and erosion control. In addition, the City has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board which requires the City to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. The City does this, in part, by means of the City's 2016 Design/Construction Standards, which require preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. All permanent stormwater quality control measures must be designed to comply with the City's Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development, the City's 2016 Design/Construction Standards, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, and Stormwater Quality Design Manual. For these reasons, impacts related to water quality are less than significant.

B, d) The project does not involve the installation of groundwater wells. The City maintains wells to supplement surface water supplies during multiple dry years, but the effect of groundwater extraction on the aquifer was addressed in the City's Urban Water Master Plan and evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, and is thus consistent with the citywide evaluation of water supply. Project impacts related to groundwater extraction are less than significant. Furthermore, all permanent stormwater quality control measures must be designed to comply with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual, which requires the use of bioswales and other onsite detention and infiltration methods. These standards ensure that stormwater will continue to infiltrate into the groundwater aquifer.

C (ii and iii)) The project has been reviewed by City Engineering staff for conformance with City ordinances and standards. The project includes adequate and appropriate facilities to ensure no net increase in the amount or rate of stormwater runoff from the site, and which will adequately convey stormwater flows.

c (iv) and e) The project has been reviewed by City Engineering staff for conformance with City ordinances and standards. The project is not located within either the Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain or the City’s Regulatory Floodplain (defined as the floodplain which will result from full buildout of the City). Therefore, the project will not impede or redirect flood flows, nor will it be inundated. The proposed project is located within an area of flat topography and is not near a waterbody or other feature which could cause a seiche or tsunami. There would be no impact with regard to these criterion.

**XI. Land Use and Planning**

The site is currently undeveloped and has a zoning designation of Community Commercial/Special Area-North Central (CC/SA-NC) and a General Plan land use designation of Business Professional/Community Commercial (BP/CC). The project has frontage on Conference Center Drive to the east. Parcels immediately adjacent to the site to the north, east, and west have a land use of BP/CC, while Open Space is located to the east and south of the site. The Open Space corridor is also designated as Floodplain, as the City’s Regulatory Floodplain is located in the Open Space.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to land use is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a and b listed above. Consistency with applicable City General Plan policies, Improvement Standards, and design standards is already required and part of the City’s processing of permits and plans, so these requirements do not appear as mitigation measures.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The project area has been master planned for development, including adequate roads, pedestrian paths, and bicycle paths to provide connections within the community. The project will not physically divide an established community.

b) As part of project review, staff considered consistency with all City policies and regulations, including those which are intended to avoid an environmental effect, and found the project to be consistent.

**XII. Mineral Resources**

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 requires the State Geologist to classify land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ’s) based on the known or inferred mineral resource potential of that land. The California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) was historically responsible for the classification and

designation of areas containing—or potentially containing—significant mineral resources, though that responsibility now lies with the California Geological Survey (CGS). CDMG published Open File Report 95-10, which provides the mineral classification map for Placer County. A detailed evaluation of mineral resources has not been conducted within the City limits, but MRZ’s have been identified. There are four broad MRZ categories (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4), and only MRZ-2 represents an area of known significant mineral resources. The City of Roseville General Plan EIR included Exhibit 4.1-3, depicting the location of MRZ’s in the City limits. There is only one small MRZ-2 designation area, located at the far eastern edge of the City.

Would the project:

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

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to mineral resources is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a and b listed above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–b) The project site is not in the area of the City known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project has no impacts on mineral resources.

**XIII. Noise**

The project site is located adjacent to Conference Center Drive to the west, which is not identified as a transportation noise source in the City’s General Plan Noise Element. However, the project site is located approximately 800 feet southwest of Highway 65 and approximately 1,100 feet northeast of Roseville Parkway, which are both identified as transportation noise sources in the City’s General Plan Noise Element. In the existing and future conditions, the 65 db L<sub>dn</sub> contour line for both of these roadways covers the entire project site (City of Roseville General Plan 2035 Noise Element, Figures IX-1 and IX-2). Other uses within the vicinity of the site include retail and commercial uses, which generate low outdoor noise. The nearest sensitive receptor is the multi-family residential use located approximately 600 feet away to the west, across Gibson Drive.

Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration of ground borne noise levels?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

Standards for transportation noise and non-transportation noise affecting existing or proposed land uses are established within the City of Roseville General Plan Noise Element, and these standards are used as the thresholds to determine the significance of impacts related to items a and c. The significance of other noise impacts is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items b and c listed above. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City Noise Regulation (RMC Ch. 9.24) will prevent significant non-transportation noise as it relates to items a and b. The Ordinance establishes noise exposure standards that protect noise-sensitive receptors from a variety of noise sources, including non-transportation/fixed noise, amplified sound, industrial noise, and events on public property. The project is not within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport and there are also no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, item c has been ruled out from further analysis.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The project is a skilled nursing facility, which is not considered to be a noise-generating use. Emergency response calls may be greater at these types of facilities compared to other uses. However, siren noise is exempt from the City’s Noise Ordinance and would be brief. The active outdoor areas of the project consist of courtyard areas for residents. Typically with outdoor areas an increase in noise is associated with these areas as people converse outdoors. However, the increase in noise would not affect the surrounding uses as the courtyard areas will be located internal to the site and will be shielded by the proposed buildings. Noise impacts from the development of the site were already considered with the NCRSP EIR, and were found to be less than

significant with adherence to the City’s operational noise level standards. The project will not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of City standards; thus, impacts are less than significant.

b) Surrounding uses may experience short-term increases in groundborne vibration, groundborne noise, and airborne noise levels during construction. However, these increases would only occur for a short period of time. When conducted during daytime hours, construction activities are exempt from Noise Ordinance standards, but the standards do apply to construction occurring during nighttime hours. While the noise generated may be a minor nuisance, the City Noise Regulation standards are designed to ensure that impacts are not unduly intrusive. Based on this, the impact is less than significant.

**XIV. Population and Housing**

The project site is located within the NCRSP and has a land use designation of Business Professional/Community Commercial (BP/CC). The City of Roseville General Plan Table II-4 identifies the total number of residential units and population anticipated as a result of buildout of the City, and the Specific Plan likewise includes unit allocations and population projections for the Plan Area. Would the project:

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

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to population and housing is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a and b listed above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The CEQA Guidelines identify several ways in which a project could have growth-inducing impacts (Public Resources Code Section 15126.2), either directly or indirectly. Growth-inducement may be the result of fostering economic growth, fostering population growth, providing new housing, or removing barriers to growth. Growth inducement may be detrimental, beneficial, or of no impact or significance under CEQA. An impact is only deemed to occur when it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be shown that the growth will significantly affect the environment in some other way. The project is consistent with the land use designation of the site. Therefore, while the project in question will induce some level of growth, this growth was already identified and its effects disclosed and mitigated within the NCRSP EIR. Therefore, the impact of the project is less than significant.

b) The project site is vacant. No housing exists on the project site, and there would be no impact with respect to these criteria.

**XV. Public Services**

Fire protection, police protection, park services, and library services are provided by the City. The project is located within the Roseville Elementary School District and the Roseville Joint Union High School District. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

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

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to public services is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. The EIR for the Specific Plan addressed the level of public services which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Development Agreements and other conditions have been adopted in all proposed growth areas of the City which identify the physical facilities needed to serve growth, and the funding needed to provide for the construction and operation of those facilities and services; the project is consistent with the Specific Plan. In addition, the project has been routed to the various public service agencies, both internal and external, to ensure that the project meets the agencies’ design standards (where applicable) and to provide an opportunity to recommend appropriate conditions of approval.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) Existing City codes and regulations require adequate water pressure in the water lines, and construction must comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes used by the City of Roseville. Additionally, the applicant is required to pay a fire service construction tax, which is used for purchasing capital facilities for the Fire Department. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

b) Sales taxes and property taxes resulting from the development will add revenue to the General Fund, which also serves to fund police services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

c) The applicant for this project is required to pay school impact fees at a rate determined by the local school districts. School fees will be collected prior to the issuance of building permits, consistent with City requirements. School sites have already been designated as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

d) Future park and recreation sites and facilities have already been identified as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

e) Sales taxes and property taxes resulting from development will add revenue to the General Fund, which provides funding for the library system and other facilities and services. In addition, the City charges fees to end-users for other services, such as garbage and greenwaste collection, in order to fund those services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

**XVI. Recreation**

The project site is located within two (2) miles of three parks: Vencil Brown Park (1.8 miles west), Buljan Park (1.9 miles west), and Diamond Oaks Park (1.7 miles south). In addition, the project is located immediately adjacent to an Open Space Corridor to the east, which contains the south branch of Pleasant Grove Creek.

Would the project:

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

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to recreation services is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–b listed above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The EIR for the NCRSP addressed the level of park services—including new construction, maintenance, and operations—which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Given that the project is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan, the project would not cause any unforeseen or new impacts related to the use of existing or proposed parks and recreational facilities. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

b) Park sites and other recreational facilities were identified within the NCRSP, and the plan-level impacts of developing those facilities were addressed within the Final EIR for the NCRSP. The project will not cause any unforeseen or new impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

**XVII. Transportation**

The project site is located on Conference Center Drive, to the east of the intersection of Conference Center Drive and Gibson Drive. The project frontage along Conference Center Drive is improved with sidewalks, curb, and gutter, and consists of bike lanes. Ingress and egress for the project will be provided by a new driveway on Conference Center Drive that will provide for full-turning movements.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?            |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature(s) (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The City has adopted the following plans, ordinances, or policies applicable to checklist item a: Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Short-Range Transit Plan, and General Plan Circulation Element. The project is evaluated for consistency with these plans and the policies contained within them. For checklist item b, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 establishes a detailed process for evaluating the significance of transportation impacts. In accordance with this section, the analysis must focus on the generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT); effects on automobile delay cannot be considered a significant impact. The City developed analysis guidance and thresholds as part of the 2035 General Plan Update project approved in July 2020. The detailed evaluation and justification is contained within the General Plan EIR.

Future projects consistent with the General Plan will not require further VMT analysis, pursuant to the tiering provisions of CEQA. For projects which are inconsistent, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) allows lead agencies discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(b) allows lead agencies the discretion to select their own thresholds and allow for differences in thresholds based on context.

Quantitative analysis would not be required if it can be demonstrated that the project would generate VMT which is equivalent to or less than what was assumed in the General Plan EIR. Examples of such projects include:

- 
- Local-serving retail and other local-serving development, which generally reduces existing trip distances by providing services in closer proximity to residential areas, and therefore reduce VMT.
  - Multi-family residences, which generally have fewer trips per household than single-family residences, and therefore also produce less VMT per unit.
  - Infill projects in developed areas generally have shorter trips, reduced vehicle trips, and therefore less VMT.
  - Pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and electric vehicle transportation projects.
  - Residential projects in low per-capita household VMT areas and office projects in low per-worker VMT areas (85 percent or less than the regional average) as shown on maps maintained by SACOG or within low VMT areas as shown within Table 4.3-8 of the General Plan EIR.

When quantitative analysis is required, the threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita may be used for projects not within the scope of the General Plan EIR, provided the cumulative context of the 2035 General Plan has not changed substantially. Since approval of the 2035 General Plan, the City has not annexed new land, substantially changed roadway network assumptions, or made any other changes to the 2035 assumptions which would require an update to the City's VMT thresholds contained within the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita remains appropriate.

No qualitative VMT analysis was conducted for the proposed project, as the development is consistent with the General Plan land use designation.

Impacts with regard to items c and d are assessed based on the expert judgment of the City Engineer and City Fire Department, as based upon facts and consistency with the City's Design and Construction Standards.

#### **Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The City of Roseville has adopted a Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Short-Range Transit Plan. The project was reviewed for consistency with these documents, and no conflicts were identified. The project is located in an area planned for commercial uses. Conference Center Drive, which is located adjacent to the northwestern boundary of the project site, is developed with sidewalks and bike lanes. This road serves the subject parcel and has direct connection to Gibson Drive to the west. The proposed project will be constructed consistent with the existing roadway system and in compliance with the requirements of the Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Short Range Transit Plan.

b) The proposed project is a skilled nursing facility, which is considered a commercial use consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The project does not include any unique characteristics which would draw in regional traffic, or which would prompt longer trips. The project would locate services and employment in proximity to existing developed areas, and would therefore have a neutral or positive impact on VMT. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, and is therefore consistent with the VMT assumptions in the GPU EIR; impacts are less than significant.

c, d) The project has been reviewed by the City Engineering and City Fire Department staff, and has been found to be consistent with the City's Design Standards including emergency vehicle circulation requirements. Furthermore, standard conditions of approval added to all City project require compliance with Fire Codes and other design standards. Compliance with existing regulations ensure that impacts are less than significant.

**XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources**

As described within the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the Roseville region was within the territory of the Nisenan (also Southern Maidu or Valley Maidu). Two large permanent Nisenan habitation sites have been identified and protected within the City’s open space (in Maidu Park). Numerous smaller cultural resources, such as midden deposits and bedrock mortars, have also been recorded in the City. A majority of documented sites within the City are located in areas designated for open space uses.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as either 1) a site, feature, place, geographically-defined cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources or as 2) a resource determined by the lead agency, supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

## Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a&b) The site is not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources. Notice of the proposed project was mailed to tribes which had requested such notice pursuant to AB 52. A request for consultation was received by the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC). Per the tribe (verbatim), the UAIC is a federally recognized Tribe comprised of both Miwok and Maidu (Nisenan) Tribal members who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The Tribe has a deep spiritual, cultural, and physical ties to their ancestral land and are contemporary stewards of their culture and landscapes. The Tribal community represents a continuity and endurance of their ancestors by maintaining their connection to their history and culture. It is the Tribe's goal to ensure the preservation and continuance of their cultural heritage for current and future generations.

On October 12, 2022 staff met with UAIC representatives on the project site. As per the tribe (verbatim), UAIC conducted background search for the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources for this project, which included a review of pertinent literature, historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the California Historic Resources Information System Center (CHRIS) as well as historic resources and survey data. The UAIC subsequently closed consultation with incorporation of a standard unanticipated discoveries measure, **Mitigation Measure TCR-1**. The measure is designed to reduce impacts to resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NCRSP EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Unanticipated Discoveries**

If any suspected TCRs, including but not limited to cultural features, midden/cultural soils, artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), shell, bone, shaped stones, or ash/charcoal are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archaeologist.

A Tribal Representative shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

#### Treatment:

The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.

The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size is determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from small lock boxes to context boxes.

The construction contractor(s) and agency shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe’s preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.

Work at the discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the lead agency in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.

If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the Placer County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the Placer County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

**XIX. Utilities and Service Systems**

Water and sewer services will be provided by the City of Roseville. The developer will be responsible for extending new lines onto the site in order to serve the project. Storm water will be collected on-site and transferred via pipe into an off-site storm drain system. Solid waste will be collected by the City of Roseville’s Refuse Department. The City of Roseville will provide electric service to the site, while natural gas will be provided by PG&E. Comcast will provide cable. The project has been reviewed by the City’s Engineering Division, Environmental Utilities, Roseville Electric and PG&E. Adequate services are available for the project.

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?                              |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to utilities and service systems is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a) The project is consistent with the Specific Plan, and will be required to construct any utilities infrastructure necessary to serve the project, as well as pay fees which fund the operation of the facilities and the construction of major infrastructure. The construction impacts related to building the major infrastructure were disclosed in the EIR for the Specific Plan, and appropriate mitigation was adopted. Minor additional infrastructure will be constructed within the project site to tie the project into the major systems, but these facilities will be constructed in locations where site development is already occurring as part of the overall project; there are no additional substantial impacts specific or particular to the minor infrastructure improvements.

b) The City of Roseville 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), adopted May 2016, estimates water demand and supply for the City through the year 2040, based on existing land use designations and population projections. In addition, the General Plan EIR estimates water demand and supply for ultimate General Plan buildout. The project is consistent with existing land use designations, and is therefore consistent with the assumptions of the UWMP and General Plan EIR. The UWMP indicates that existing water supply sources are sufficient to meet all near term needs, estimating an annual water demand of 48,762 acre-feet per year (AFY) by the year 2035 and existing surface and recycled water supplies in the amount of 60,400 AFY in normal years. The UWMP establishes some water supply deficit during dry year scenarios, but establishes that mandatory water conservation measures and the use of groundwater to offset reductions in surface water supplies are sufficient to offset the deficit. The project, which is consistent with existing land use designations, would not require new or expanded water supply entitlements.

c) The proposed project would be served by the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality and quantity of effluent discharged from the City’s wastewater treatment facilities. The Pleasant Grove WWTP has the capacity<sup>4</sup> to treat 12 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently treating 7.0<sup>5</sup> mgd. The project is consistent with existing land use designations, which is how infrastructure capacity is planned. Therefore, the volume of wastewater generated by the proposed project could be accommodated by the facility; the proposed project will not contribute to an exceedance of applicable wastewater treatment requirements. The impact would be less than significant.

d, e) The Western Placer Waste Management Authority is the regional agency handling recycling and waste disposal for Roseville and surrounding areas. The regional waste facilities include a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL). Currently, the WRSL is permitted to accept up to 1,900 tons of municipal solid waste per day. According to the solid waste analysis of the General Plan EIR, under current projected development conditions the WRSL has a projected lifespan extending through 2058. There is sufficient existing capacity to serve the proposed project. Though the project will contribute incrementally to an eventual need to find other means of waste disposal, this impact of City buildout has already been disclosed and mitigation applied as part of each Specific Plan the City has approved. All residences and business in the City pay fees for solid waste collection, a portion of which is collected to fund eventual solid waste disposal expansion. The project will not result in any new impacts associated with major infrastructure. Environmental Utilities staff has reviewed the project for consistency with policies, codes, and regulations related to waste disposal and waste reduction regulations and policies and has found that the project design is in compliance.

**XX. Wildfire**

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

<sup>4</sup> Waste Discharge Requirements/Monitoring & Reporting Program/NPDES Permit No. CA0079502, Adopted on 28 March 2014

<sup>5</sup> Dave Samuelson, City of Roseville Environmental Utilities, Personal communication, July 6, 2016.

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

**Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to wildfire is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–d listed above. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the state agency responsible for wildland fire protection and management. As part of that task, CAL FIRE maintains maps designating Wildland Fire Hazard Severity zones. The City is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and is not in a CAL FIRE responsibility area; fire suppression is entirely within local responsibility.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–d) Checklist questions a–d above do not apply, because the project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and is not in a CAL FIRE responsibility area.

**XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

| Environmental Issue  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

| Environmental Issue   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| endangered, threatened or rare species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?   |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

**Significance Criteria and Regulatory Setting:**

The significance of impacts related to mandatory findings of significance is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–c listed above.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a–c) Long term environmental goals are not impacted by the proposed project. The cumulative impacts do not deviate beyond what was contemplated in the North Central Specific Plan EIR, and mitigation measures have already been incorporated via the EIR. With implementation of the City’s Mitigating Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards and best management practices, mitigation measures described in this chapter, and permit conditions, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on the habitat of any plant or animal species. Based on the foregoing, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of any wildlife species, or create adverse effects on human beings.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**

---

*In reviewing the site specific information provided for this project and acting as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that with mitigation the impacts are less than significant. As demonstrated in the initial study checklist, there are no “project specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site” that cannot be reduced to less than significant effects through mitigation (CEQA Section 15183) and therefore an EIR is **not** required. Therefore, **on the basis of the foregoing initial study:***

[ **X** ] I find that the proposed project COULD, but with mitigation agreed to by the applicant, clearly will not have a significant effect on the environment and a *MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION* has been prepared.

Initial Study Prepared by:

*Kinarik Shallow*

---

Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner  
City of Roseville, Development Services – Planning Division

## **Attachments:**

---

1. CalEEMod Results
2. Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program

# 1. Basic Project Information

## 1.1. Basic Project Information

| Data Field                  | Value                              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Project Name                | Skilled Nursing Facility           |
| Construction Start Date     | 4/1/2025                           |
| Operational Year            | 2026                               |
| Lead Agency                 | —                                  |
| Land Use Scale              | Project/site                       |
| Analysis Level for Defaults | County                             |
| Windspeed (m/s)             | 3.50                               |
| Precipitation (days)        | 0.60                               |
| Location                    | 38.777025971314, -121.271321186195 |
| County                      | Placer-Sacramento                  |
| City                        | Roseville                          |
| Air District                | Placer County APCD                 |
| Air Basin                   | Sacramento Valley                  |
| TAZ                         | 467                                |
| EDFZ                        | 15                                 |
| Electric Utility            | Roseville Electric                 |
| Gas Utility                 | Pacific Gas & Electric             |
| App Version                 | 2022.1.1.22                        |

## 1.2. Land Use Types

| Land Use Subtype | Size | Unit | Lot Acreage | Building Area (sq ft) | Landscape Area (sq ft) | Special Landscape Area (sq ft) | Population | Description |
|------------------|------|------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|------------------|------|------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|

|                                   |     |               |      |        |        |   |     |   |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---------------|------|--------|--------|---|-----|---|
| Congregate Care (Assisted Living) | 120 | Dwelling Unit | 4.25 | 53,600 | 42,487 | — | 120 | — |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---------------|------|--------|--------|---|-----|---|

### 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

## 2. Emissions Summary

### 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit.             | TOG  | ROG  | NOx  | CO   | SO2     | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T  | CH4  | N2O  | R    | CO2e  |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —     | —     | —     | —      | —      | —      | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 4.01 | 23.5 | 31.7 | 31.1 | 0.05    | 1.37  | 19.8  | 21.2  | 1.26   | 10.1   | 11.4   | —    | 5,491 | 5,491 | 0.22 | 0.11 | 4.43 | 5,511 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —     | —     | —     | —      | —      | —      | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 1.66 | 1.40 | 11.2 | 16.5 | 0.03    | 0.44  | 0.97  | 1.40  | 0.40   | 0.23   | 0.63   | —    | 3,614 | 3,614 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 3,650 |
| Average Daily (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —     | —     | —     | —      | —      | —      | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 0.99 | 1.45 | 6.95 | 9.26 | 0.01    | 0.28  | 0.87  | 1.14  | 0.26   | 0.32   | 0.57   | —    | 1,948 | 1,948 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.87 | 1,966 |
| Annual (Max)        | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —     | —     | —     | —      | —      | —      | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 0.18 | 0.26 | 1.27 | 1.69 | < 0.005 | 0.05  | 0.16  | 0.21  | 0.05   | 0.06   | 0.10   | —    | 323   | 323   | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 325   |

### 2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

| Un/Mit. | TOG | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10E | PM10D | PM10T | PM2.5E | PM2.5D | PM2.5T | BCO2 | NBCO2 | CO2T | CH4 | N2O | R | CO2e |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|---|------|
|---------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|---|------|

|                     |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |       |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Daily, Summer (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 2.51 | 3.60 | 1.83 | 20.4 | 0.03    | 0.06 | 2.49 | 2.55 | 0.06 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 66.6 | 4,455 | 4,521 | 6.89 | 0.15 | 10.9 | 4,750 |
| Daily, Winter (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 1.66 | 2.78 | 1.99 | 11.6 | 0.03    | 0.06 | 2.49 | 2.54 | 0.06 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 66.6 | 4,172 | 4,239 | 6.91 | 0.17 | 0.95 | 4,462 |
| Average Daily (Max) | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 1.77 | 2.88 | 1.73 | 13.2 | 0.03    | 0.06 | 2.15 | 2.21 | 0.05 | 0.55 | 0.60 | 66.6 | 3,849 | 3,915 | 6.88 | 0.14 | 4.50 | 4,134 |
| Annual (Max)        | —    | —    | —    | —    | —       | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —     | —     | —    | —    | —    | —     |
| Unmit.              | 0.32 | 0.53 | 0.31 | 2.42 | < 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 11.0 | 637   | 648   | 1.14 | 0.02 | 0.75 | 684   |

## 6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

### 6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard               | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | 4              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |
| Extreme Precipitation        | 2              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |
| Sea Level Rise               | N/A            | N/A               | N/A                     | N/A                 |
| Wildfire                     | 1              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |
| Flooding                     | 0              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |
| Drought                      | 0              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |
| Snowpack Reduction           | N/A            | N/A               | N/A                     | N/A                 |
| Air Quality Degradation      | 0              | 0                 | 0                       | N/A                 |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

### 6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

| Climate Hazard               | Exposure Score | Sensitivity Score | Adaptive Capacity Score | Vulnerability Score |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Temperature and Extreme Heat | 4              | 1                 | 1                       | 4                   |
| Extreme Precipitation        | 2              | 1                 | 1                       | 3                   |
| Sea Level Rise               | N/A            | N/A               | N/A                     | N/A                 |
| Wildfire                     | 1              | 1                 | 1                       | 2                   |
| Flooding                     | 1              | 1                 | 1                       | 2                   |
| Drought                      | 1              | 1                 | 1                       | 2                   |
| Snowpack Reduction           | N/A            | N/A               | N/A                     | N/A                 |
| Air Quality Degradation      | 1              | 1                 | 1                       | 2                   |

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

## 7. Health and Equity Details

### 7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

| Metric  | Result for Project Census Tract |
|---|---------------------------------|
| CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a)                                  | 33.0                            |
| Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b)                                 | 64.0                            |
| Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535)           | No                              |
| Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550)                      | No                              |
| Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617) | No                              |

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

## 7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed.



MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table with 2 columns: Field Name and Value. Fields include Project Title/File Number, Project Location, Project Description, Environmental Document, Project Applicant, Property Owner, and Lead Agency Contact Person.

Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code requires public agencies to "adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been adopted for the purpose of avoiding environmental impacts

MONITORING PROCESS: Existing monitoring mechanisms are in place that assist the City of Roseville in meeting the intent of CEQA. These existing monitoring mechanisms eliminate the need to develop new monitoring processes for each mitigation measure. These mechanisms include grading plan review and approval, improvement/building plan review and approval and on-site inspections by City Departments. Given that these monitoring processes are requirements of the project, they are not included in the mitigation monitoring program.

It shall be the responsibility of the project applicant/owner to provide written notification to the City using the Mitigation Verification Cover Sheet and Forms, in a timely manner, of the completion of each Mitigation Measure as identified on the following pages. The City will verify that the project is in compliance with the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Any non-compliance will be reported by the City to the applicant/owner, and it shall be the project applicant's/owner's responsibility to rectify the situation by bringing the project into compliance. The purpose of this program is to ensure diligent and good faith compliance with the Mitigation Measures which have been adopted as part of the project.

**TABLE OF MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Mitigation Measure   | Implementation   | Timing   | Reviewing Party                 | Documents to be Submitted to City | Staff Use Only |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| <p><b>Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Unanticipated Discoveries</b></p> <p>If any suspected TCRs, including but not limited to cultural features, midden/cultural soils, artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), shell, bone, shaped stones, or ash/charcoal are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archaeologist.</p> <p>A Tribal Representative shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.</p> <p><u>Treatment:</u></p> <p>The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size is determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from small lock boxes to context boxes.</p> <p>The construction contractor(s) and agency shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.</p> <p>Work at the discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the lead agency in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the Placer County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the Placer County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.</p> | <p>This condition shall be reflected in all construction and building plans, and construction site workers shall be advised by the site manager of this measure.</p> | <p><i>Construction:</i> Measure applies if resources are discovered during construction.</p> <p>Add as note on Improvement Plans and Building Plans.</p> | <p>Engineering and Building</p> | <p>None</p>                       |                |



MITIGATION VERIFICATION SUBMITTAL COVER SHEET

Project Title/Planning File # NCRSP PCL 40 – Roseville Transitional Care; File #PL22-0211
Project Address 250 Conference Center Drive, Roseville, Placer County, CA 95678 (APN 363-011-013-000)
Property Owner Cordova 83 Properties, LLC
Planning Division Contact Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner; Phone (916) 746-1309

SUMMARY OF VERIFICATION MATERIALS INCLUDED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

Table with 3 columns: Mitigation Measure, Supporting Attachments Included, Date Complete. The table is currently empty.

I HAVE ATTACHED THE FOLLOWING REQUIRED ITEMS:

- Table of Applicable Mitigation Measures
Mitigation Verification Form(s)
Specific supporting documentation required by measure(s), if applicable (e.g. biologist's report)

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that I am the property owner or an agent of the property owner and am authorized to submit this Mitigation Verification Form. I also certify that the above-listed mitigation measures have been completed in the manner required, and that all of the information in this submittal is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge:

Signature and Date Print Name Contact Number

# MITIGATION VERIFICATION FORM

Mitigation Measure \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Monitoring and Verification Work Performed. The following information is a required part of the description: dates, personnel names or titles, and the stage/phase of construction work. Additional notes sheets may be attached, if necessary, or the below may simply reference a separate attachment that provides the required information.

# INSTRUCTIONS

## COVER SHEET:

A Cover Sheet for the project/development is prepared by City staff, with the top portion filled out. Each time Mitigation Verification Forms(s) are being submitted, a Cover Sheet completed by the Developer, Contractor, or Designee is required. An example of a completed summary table is provided below. The signature on the Cover Sheet must be *original wet ink*.

## EXAMPLE MITIGATION VERIFICATION SUBMITTAL COVER SHEET

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project Title/Planning File #</b> | New Coffee Shop, PL15-0000                     |
| <b>Project Address</b>               | 10 Justashort Street                           |
| <b>Property Owner</b>                | Jane Owner                                     |
| <b>Planning Division Contact</b>     | Joe Planner, Associate Planner, (916) 774-#### |

### SUMMARY OF VERIFICATION MATERIALS INCLUDED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

| Mitigation Measure | Supporting Attachments Included                          | Date Complete |
|--------------------|--|---------------|
| MM-3               | Copy of survey report signed by biologist                | 5/10/2016     |
| MM-4               | All information included in Mitigation Verification Form | 5/12/2016     |
| MM-5               | E-mail from Air District approving Dust Control Plan     | 5/05/2016     |

## MITIGATION VERIFICATION FORM:

A Mitigation Verification Form is provided by City staff, along with the Cover Sheet and Table of Applicable Mitigation Measures. A form is filled in and submitted for each mitigation measure by the Developer, Contractor, or Designee. The form needs only the mitigation number to be filled in, along with the Description of Monitoring and Verification Work Performed. Multiple forms may be submitted simultaneously, under one cover sheet. It is also permissible to submit a form for each part of a measure, on separate dates. For instance, in the example measure MM-4 in the table above, the actual mitigation requires informing construction workers *and* retaining a qualified archeologist if resources are uncovered. Thus, a developer may submit a form in May certifying that construction workers have been informed, and also submit a second copy of the form in July because resources were discovered and additional actions had to be undertaken.

Each mitigation measure specifies the type of supporting documentation required; this must be submitted in order for the City to accept the mitigation as complete. An example of a completed Mitigation Verification Form is provided below.

## **EXAMPLE** **MITIGATION VERIFICATION FORM**

### Mitigation Measure MM3

Description of Monitoring and Verification Work Performed. The following information is a required part of the description: dates, personnel names or titles, and the stage/phase of construction work. Additional notes sheets may be attached, if necessary, or the below may simply reference a separate attachment that provides the required information.

The mitigation measure text is included on the Improvement Plans General Notes page (Improvement Plan EN15-0001). On May 4, 2016, prior to any ground-disturbing activities (the pre-construction phase), a site meeting was held. At this meeting, workers on the site were informed of the potential to unearth remains, and were instructed to cease work and notify their supervisor immediately if any resources were observed.