

United States Army Corps of Engineers

AMORUSO RANCH PROJECT

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USACE Action ID: SPK-2004-00888

Volume I



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814-2922
(916) 557-6605

January 2019

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Amoruso Ranch Project

USACE Action ID: SPK-2004-00888

Volume I

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Prepared by:

Impact Sciences, Inc.
505 14th Street, Suite 900
Oakland, California 94612

January 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Abstract	
ES	Executive Summary ES-1
	Purpose of this Document ES-1
	Purpose and Need for Action ES-2
	Proposed Action and Alternatives ES-2
	Major Conclusions of the Environmental Analysis ES-4
	Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved ES-8
	Intended Uses Of The EIS..... ES-8
1.0	Introduction and Statement of Purpose and Need1.0-1
1.1	Introduction and Project Requiring Environmental Analysis1.0-1
1.2	Project Location1.0-2
1.3	Project Purpose and Need.....1.0-2
1.4	Project Background1.0-6
1.5	NEPA Requirements and Process.....1.0-7
1.6	Scope and Focus of this Environmental Impact Statement1.0-8
1.7	Lead Agency and Other Agencies with Jurisdiction over the Project1.0-9
1.8	EIS Scoping1.0-9
1.9	Availability of Environmental Impact Statement1.0-9
1.10	Intended Use of this Document.....1.0-10
1.11	Regulatory Framework/Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies Applicable to the EIS.....1.0-10
1.12	Organization of this Environmental Impact Statement1.0-39
1.13	Standard Terminology, Acronyms, and Abbreviations.....1.0-40
2.0	Proposed Action and Alternatives2.0-1
2.1	Introduction2.0-1
2.2	NEPA Requirements for Evaluation of Alternatives.....2.0-1
2.3	Development of Alternatives to Proposed Action.....2.0-2
2.4	Proposed Action.....2.0-3
2.4.1	Land Use Plan2.0-4
2.4.2	Circulation System.....2.0-11
2.4.3	Public Facilities and Services.....2.0-12
2.4.4	Off-Site Mitigation Properties2.0-14
2.4.5	Project Implementation.....2.0-15
2.4.6	Measures Adopted by the City of Roseville.....2.0-17
2.4.7	Required Permits and Approvals2.0-17
2.5	Alternatives Analyzed in the EIS2.0-18
2.5.1	No Action Alternative2.0-18
2.5.2	Alternative1: Southern Avoidance Alternative2.0-19
2.5.3	Alternative 2: Northern Avoidance Alternative2.0-21
2.5.4	Alternative 3: Distributed Avoidance Alternative2.0-21
2.6	Summary Comparison of Proposed Action and Alternatives2.0-25

2.7	Alternatives Considered but Rejected.....	2.0-26
2.7.1	On-Site Alternatives Identification and Screening.....	2.0-26
2.7.2	Off-Site Alternatives Identification and Screening.....	2.0-27
2.8	References	2.0-30
3.0	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	3.0-1
3.0.1	Introduction	3.0-1
3.0.2	Scope of the EIS	3.0-1
3.0.3	Section Contents and Definition of Terms.....	3.0-2
3.0.4	Topics with Less Than Significant or No Impacts from the Proposed Action and Alternatives.....	3.0-4
3.1	Aesthetics	3.1-1
3.1.1	Introduction.....	3.1-1
3.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3.1-1
3.1.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.1-2
3.1.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.1-3
3.1.5	References	3.1-8
3.2	Agricultural Resources.....	3.2-1
3.2.1	Introduction.....	3.2-1
3.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3.2-1
3.2.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.2-9
3.2.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.2-10
3.2.5	References	3.2-14
3.3	Air Quality	3.3-1
3.3.1	Introduction.....	3.3-1
3.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3.3-1
3.3.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.3-8
3.3.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.3-13
3.3.5	General Conformity.....	3.3-33
3.3.6	References	3.3-36
3.4	Aquatic Resources.....	3.4-1
3.4.1	Introduction.....	3.4-1
3.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3.4-1
3.4.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.4-10
3.4.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.4-11
3.4.5	References	3.4-30
3.5	Biological Resources	3.5-1
3.5.1	Introduction.....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3.5-1
3.5.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.5-26
3.5.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.5-27
3.5.5	References	3.5-48
3.6	Climate Change	3.6-1
3.6.1	Introduction.....	3.6-1
3.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3.6-1
3.6.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.6-8
3.6.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.6-11
3.6.5	References	3.6-15

3.7	Cultural Resources	3.7-1
3.7.1	Introduction	3.7-1
3.7.2	Affected Environment	3.7-2
3.7.3	Regulatory Framework – Applicable Laws, Regulations, Plans and Policies.....	3.7-10
3.7.4	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.7-12
3.7.5	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.7-16
3.7.6	References	3.7-18
3.8	Environmental Justice, Population and Housing	3.8-1
3.8.1	Introduction.....	3.8-1
3.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3.8-1
3.8.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.8-4
3.8.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.8-6
3.8.5	References	3.8-8
3.9	Geology, Soils, and Minerals	3.9-1
3.9.1	Introduction.....	3.9-1
3.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3.9-1
3.9.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.9-7
3.9.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.9-7
3.9.5	References	3.9-11
3.10	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Introduction.....	3.10-1
3.10.2	Affected Environment.....	3.10-1
3.10.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.10-4
3.10.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.10-5
3.10.5	References	3.10-10
3.11	Hydrology and Water Quality	3.11-1
3.11.1	Introduction.....	3.11-1
3.11.2	Affected Environment.....	3.11-1
3.11.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.11-8
3.11.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.11-9
3.11.5	References	3.11-24
3.12	Land Use and Planning	3.12-1
3.12.1	Introduction.....	3.12-1
3.12.2	Affected Environment.....	3.12-1
3.12.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.12-2
3.12.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.12-3
3.12.5	References	3.12-10
3.13	Noise	3.13-1
3.13.1	Introduction.....	3.13-1
3.13.2	Affected Environment.....	3.13-1
3.13.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.13-5
3.13.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.13-9
3.13.5	References	3.13-27

3.14	Public Services	3.14-1
3.14.1	Introduction.....	3.14-1
3.14.2	Affected Environment.....	3.14-1
3.14.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.14-5
3.14.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.14-5
3.14.5	References	3.14-11
3.15	Transportation and Traffic.....	3.15-1
3.15.1	Introduction.....	3.15-1
3.15.2	Affected Environment.....	3.15-1
3.15.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.15-10
3.15.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.15-15
3.15.5	References	3.15-22
3.16	Utilities and Service Systems	3.16-1
3.16.1	Introduction.....	3.16-1
3.16.2	Affected Environment.....	3.16-1
3.16.3	Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology.....	3.16-11
3.16.4	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.....	3.16-13
3.16.5	References	3.16-28
4.0	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.0-1
4.1	Introduction	4.0-1
4.2	Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	4.0-1
4.2.1	Identification of Resources to consider in the Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	4.0-2
4.2.2	Definition of Timeframe for Cumulative Impact Analysis	4.0-2
4.2.3	Definition of Study Area.....	4.0-2
4.2.4	Identification of other Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions and Projects	4.0-4
4.2.5	Evaluation of Potential Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.0-8
4.3	Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives.....	4.0-8
4.3.1	Potential Waters of the U.S. and Other Biological Resources	4.0-9
4.3.2	Aesthetics.....	4.0-16
4.3.3	Agricultural Resources.....	4.0-18
4.3.4	Air Quality.....	4.0-19
4.3.5	Cultural Resources.....	4.0-25
4.3.6	Hydrology and Water Quality	4.0-26
4.3.7	Noise.....	4.0-30
4.3.8	Utilities and Service Systems.....	4.0-32
4.4	References	4.0-35

5.0	Other Statutory Requirements.....	5.0-1
5.1	Introduction	5.0-1
5.2	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	5.0-1
5.3	Significant Impacts that Cannot be Avoided	5.0-2
5.4	Relationship between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	5.0-2
5.5	Growth-Inducing Impacts.....	5.0-3
5.5.1	Elimination of Obstacles of Growth	5.0-3
5.5.2	Economic Effects	5.0-4
5.6	Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential	5.0-5
5.7	Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations.....	5.0-6
5.7.1	Federal.....	5.0-6
5.7.2	State.....	5.0-10
5.7.3	Plans and Policies	5.0-13
5.7.4	Methods of Compliance	5.0-15
5.8	References	5.0-16
6.0	Consultation and Coordination.....	6.0-1
6.1	Public Involvement.....	6.0-1
6.2	Public Notice under 33 CFR Section 325.3.....	6.0-1
6.3	Public Scoping under NEPA	6.0-1
6.4	Agency Coordination	6.0-1
6.5	Document Availability	6.0-2
7.0	List of Preparers.....	7.0-1
7.1	US Army Corps of Engineers	7.0-1
7.2	Impact Sciences, Inc	7.0-1
7.3	Subconsultants.....	7.0-1
8.0	Index.....	8.0-1

Appendices

3.4	Compensatory Mitigation Plan
3.11	Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Area Master Drainage Plan
3.15a	Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Traffic Study
3.15b	Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Focused Traffic Study
3.16a	Water Supply Assessment
3.16b	Technical Dry Utilities Study

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.0-1	Regional Setting.....	1.0-3
1.0-2	Project Location	1.0-4
2.0-1	Proposed Action	2.0-5
2.0-2	Parks and Open Space	2.0-9
2.0-3	Regional Open Space	2.0-10
2.0-4	Mitigation Properties and Vicinity.....	2.0-16
2.0-5	No Action Alternative.....	2.0-20
2.0-6	Southern Avoidance Alternative.....	2.0-22
2.0-7	Northern Avoidance Alternative	2.0-23
2.0-8	Distributed Avoidance Alternative.....	2.0-24
2.0-9	Off-Site Alternative Land Availability	2.0-29
3.2-1	Farmland Classification- Project Site	3.2-6
3.2-2	Farmland Classifications- Off-Site Mitigation Properties	3.2-8
3.4-1	Proposed Action – Aquatic Resource Impacts	3.4-14
3.4-2	Alternative 1 - Waters of the U.S. Impacts.....	3.4-20
3.4-3	Alternative 2 - Waters of the U.S. Impacts.....	3.4-24
3.4-4	Alternative 3 - Waters of the U.S. Impacts.....	3.4-27
3.5-1	Project Site Biological Communities	3.5-4
3.5-2	Off-Site Mitigation Properties Biological Communities	3.5-6
3.5-3	Special-Status Species Locations	3.5-11
3.8-1	Census Tracts Locations	3.8-2
3.9-1	Regional Fault Map.....	3.9-3
3.9-2	Soil Types.....	3.9-6
3.11-1	Existing Conditions Drainage Patterns	3.11-6
3.11-2	Western Boundary Existing Conditions Runoff Patterns	3.11-7
3.11-3	Proposed Conditions Drainage Patterns.....	3.11-15
3.14-1	Existing and Planned Fire Stations	3.14-3
3.14-2	Existing and Planned Schools and District Boundaries	3.14-4
3.15-1	Locations of Study Area Intersections.....	3.15-5
4.0-1	Placer County Portion of HUC 18020161	4.0-3
4.0-2	Aquatic Resources in PCCP Area.....	4.0-11
4.0-3	Locations of Permitted Projects within Roseville and Rocklin	4.0-12

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
ES-1 Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use and WOUS Impacts.....	ES-3
ES-2 Summary of Effects for Major Topics	ES-9
1.0-1 Regulatory Framework.....	1.0-11
2.0-1 Amoruso Ranch Project Residential Uses	2.0-6
2.0-2 Proposed Action Services and Utilities Providers	2.0-13
2.0-3 Utility Demand- Proposed Action and Alternatives	2.0-19
2.0-4 Proposed Action and Alternatives - Acreages by Land Use and WOUS Impacts	2.0-25
3.2-1 Monetary Value of Placer County Agricultural Commodities by Industry 2016.....	3.2-2
3.2-2 Top Agricultural Products in Placer County 2016.....	3.2-2
3.2-3 1998–2014 Placer County Land Use Summary (in Acres).....	3.2-5
3.2-4 Farmland Impacts (Acres).....	3.2-10
3.3-1 Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.3-4
3.3-2 Placer County Attainment Status (Western Portion of County).....	3.3-6
3.3-3 Ambient Air Pollutant Concentrations Near the Project Site.....	3.3-9
3.3-4 Placer County Air Pollution Control District Significance Thresholds (lbs/day).....	3.3-10
3.3-5 Estimated Unmitigated Construction Emissions – Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.3-14
3.3-6 Estimated Mitigated Construction Emissions – Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.3-15
3.3-7 Estimated Unmitigated Operational Emissions – Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.3-19
3.3-8 Estimated Mitigated Operational Emissions – Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.3-21
3.3-9 General Conformity De Minimis Thresholds.....	3.3-34
3.3-10 Direct Annual Construction Emissions (Unmitigated).....	3.3-35
3.4-1 Project Impact Area Aquatic Resources (in Acres)	3.4-4
3.4-2 Mitigation Properties Aquatic Resources (in Acres).....	3.4-5
3.4-3 Proposed Action Impacts to Aquatic Resources (in Acres)	3.4-13
3.4-4 Proposed Action Impacts and Mitigation Area Summary (in Acres)	3.4-16
3.4-5 Alternative 1 Impacts to Aquatic Resources (in Acres).....	3.4-19
3.4-6 Alternative 2 Impacts to Aquatic Resources (in Acres).....	3.4-22
3.4-7 Alternative 3 Impacts to Aquatic Resources (in Acres).....	3.4-26
3.4-8 Comparative Summary of Direct WOUS Effects (in Acres).....	3.4-28
3.5-1 Project Site Biological Communities.....	3.5-3
3.5-2 Off-Site Mitigation Properties Biological Communities	3.5-5
3.5-3 Special-Status Plants with Potential to occur on the Project Site and Off-site Mitigation Properties.....	3.5-12
3.5-4 Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur on the Project Site and Off-site Mitigation Properties	3.5-15
3.5-5 Proposed Action Impacts to Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrate Habitat (in Acres).....	3.5-29
3.5-6 Alternative 1 Impacts to Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrate Habitat (in Acres).....	3.5-31
3.5-7 Alternative 1 Impacts to Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrate Habitat (in Acres).....	3.5-31
3.5-8 Alternative 3 Impacts to Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrate Habitat (in Acres).....	3.5-32
3.5-9 Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat Impacts and Mitigation (in Acres).....	3.5-39
3.6-1 Comparison of Global Pre-Industrial and Current GHG Concentrations.....	3.6-5
3.6-2 Top Five GHG Producer Countries and the European Union (Annual)	3.6-6
3.6-3 GHG Emissions in California (2000 and 2015)	3.6-7

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
3.6-4	PCAPCD GHG Significance Thresholds for Construction and Stationary Source Operational Emissions.....	3.6-9
3.6-5	PCAPCD GHG Significance Thresholds for Land Development Operational Emissions	3.6-10
3.6-6	Estimated Yearly Construction GHG Emissions.....	3.6-12
3.6-7	Estimated Operational GHG Emissions	3.6-14
3.8-1	Study Area Demographics	3.8-3
3.8-2	Study Area Income and Poverty Status.....	3.8-4
3.9-1	Overview of Project Site Soils	3.9-4
3.11-1	Designated Beneficial Uses and Listed Water Quality Impairments in Project Area	3.11-4
3.11-2	2-Year & 10-Year Peak Flow Comparison (CFS).....	3.11-11
3.11-3	100-Year Peak Flow Comparison (CFS).....	3.11-12
3.13-1	Existing Traffic Noise Levels	3.13-2
3.13-2	Existing Ambient Noise Levels	3.13-5
3.13-3	City of Roseville Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure for Transportation Noise Sources	3.13-6
3.13-4	City of Roseville Performance Standards for Non-Transportation Noise Sources	3.13-7
3.13-5	Maximum Construction Equipment Noise.....	3.13-8
3.13-6	Typical Construction Equipment Noise.....	3.13-10
3.13-7	Potential Noise Levels Associated with Commercial Land Uses	3.13-14
3.13-8	Traffic Noise Levels at Proposed Residential Uses.....	3.13-20
3.13-9	Traffic Noise Levels On Local Roadways – 2035 Cumulative Conditions	3.13-23
3.15-1	Level of Service Definitions at Signalized Intersections	3.15-4
3.15-2	Level of Service Definitions on Roadway Segments	3.15-6
3.15-3	Freeway Level of Service Definitions	3.15-6
3.15-4	City of Roseville Study Intersections (Signalized) – Existing Levels of Service	3.15-7
3.15-5	Placer County Study Intersections (Unsignalized) – Existing Levels of Service	3.15-7
3.15-6	LOS on Highway Segments – Existing Conditions.....	3.15-8
3.15-7	Land Use Assumptions for Proposed Action and Alternatives.....	3.15-14
3.15-8	Proposed Action and Alternatives Trip Generation.....	3.15-14
3.15-9	City of Roseville PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations – 2035 Cumulative Conditions	3.15-23
3.15-10	Placer County AM Peak Hour Intersection Operations – 2035 Cumulative Conditions.....	3.15-23
3.15-11	AM Peak Hour Freeway Operations – 2035 Cumulative Conditions	3.15-24
3.16-1	Potable Water Demand at Buildout (Acre-Feet per Year)	3.16-12
3.16-2	Average Dry Weather Flow at Buildout (mgd).....	3.16-12
3.16-3	Solid Waste Generation, Diversion, and Disposal at Buildout	3.16-13
4.0-1	Status of Potential WOUS in the Upper Coon-Upper Auburn Watershed (PCCP Portion)	4.0-10
4.0-2	Other Present and Foreseeable Future Projects in Project Vicinity –Construction Emissions (Pounds per Day).....	4.0-21
4.0-3	Other Major DA Permit Projects in the Air Basin – Construction Emissions (Pounds per Day)	4.0-22
4.0-4	Other Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions in Project Vicinity –Operational Emissions (Pounds per Day).....	4.0-23

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
4.0-5 Other Major DA Permit Projects in the Air Basin – Operational Emissions (Pounds per Day)	4.0-24
4.0-6 Cumulative Water Demand	4.0-34
5.0-1 Employment Growth	5.0-5
5.0-2 Compliance with Applicable Laws, Policies, Plans, and Permit Requirements	5.0-15

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Amoruso Ranch Project
City of Roseville, California

USACE Action ID: SPK-2004-00888

NEPA Lead Agency:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District

NEPA Cooperating Agencies:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

City of Roseville, California

ABSTRACT

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analyzes the potential effects of authorizing, via Department of the Army (DA) permits, the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Waters of the United States, for the development of a 674-acre project site in western Placer County under the proposed Amoruso Ranch project (Proposed Action).

The Proposed Action (Applicant's Preferred Alternative) includes 337 acres of residential uses totaling 2,826 single- and multi-family residential units at buildout, 51 acres of commercial and office uses, 17 acres of public/quasi-public uses such as schools, 22 acres of parks, 38 acres of open space, and 52 acres of roadways and landscape corridors. The Proposed Action also includes off-site improvements that involve widening of Sunset Boulevard West along the north side of the project site to provide improved roadway access to the site, and the construction of storm water conveyance facilities in the Al Johnson Wildlife Area located to the west of the project site. Additionally, the applicant proposes to compensate for unavoidable impacts to aquatic resources by providing permittee-responsible mitigation (establishment, restoration, and/or preservation of aquatic resources) at three undeveloped parcels just west of the project site and south of Sunset Boulevard West.

Development of the project site under the Proposed Action would result in the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into approximately 18.70 acres of wetlands and other Waters of the United States, as defined by the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). This discharge of dredged and/or fill material requires the issuance of a Department of the Army permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA, under which the Corps either issues or denies a DA permit based on the public interest review and, where applicable, compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. The Corps intends to use this document to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

This Draft EIS has been prepared in compliance with NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing NEPA, and Corps NEPA Regulations. Consistent with NEPA requirements, this Draft EIS evaluates the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the environment that would result from the Proposed Action, including several alternatives to the Proposed Action.

This Draft EIS is available for public review and comment for 45 days from the date of publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. An electronic version of the Draft EIS can be found on the Internet at

<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Permitting/EnvironmentalImpactStatements.aspx>.

Please submit comments on this document, referencing Action ID SPK-2004-00888, via mail or electronic mail to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District

Regulatory Division

Attn: Leah M. Fisher

1325 J Street, Room 1350

Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Fax: (916) 557-6877

Electronic Mail: leah.m.fisher@usace.army.mil

Web site: www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx

ES.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Sacramento District, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to analyze and disclose the environmental effects from the proposed development of the Amoruso Ranch project (project) on an approximately 674-acre site in western Roseville for which Brookfield Sunset, LLC (Applicant or Brookfield) is seeking a Department of the Army (DA) permit from the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC. §1344).

Development of the project would result in the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into approximately 18.70 acres of wetlands and other Waters of the United States (WOUS). This discharge of dredged and/or fill material requires the issuance of a Department of the Army permit from the Corps, pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA, under which the Corps either issues or denies a DA permit. The Corps' general regulatory policies and approach are defined in 33 CFR Parts 320-328 and 330-332. In its regulatory capacity, the Corps is neither a proponent nor an opponent of projects seeking federal approvals; rather, as identified in 33 CFR § 320.1[a][1], the Corps conducts a "public interest review" that seeks to balance a proposed action's favorable impacts against its detrimental impacts. Additionally, as identified in 33 CFR §325.2[a][6], the Corps is also required to review actions in accordance with guidelines developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1344(b)(1)) (hereinafter "404(b)(1) Guidelines"). The Corps' permit process and decision-making triggers a requirement for environmental review under the NEPA. The Corps is the federal lead agency under the NEPA and has determined that the decision to issue or deny a DA permit for the project constitutes a "major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment," which requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

The Corps has determined that the project purpose for the Proposed Action is to construct a large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density master-planned community in western Placer County.

The Proposed Action is defined as a "large scale" master-planned community project because it would develop approximately 674 acres of land and provide up to 2,826 dwelling units. The Proposed Action is also proposed as a "mixed-use" community because it is not only comprised of residential but, includes commercial uses, public and quasi-public uses, parks, and open space as well.

The residential component of the project, which includes a range of housing types and residential densities, is proposed to help meet the foreseeable regional housing demand based on Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) projections in the February 2016 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that the region will add 811,000 people by 2036. The Proposed Action is designed to help serve the diverse housing needs of the region and assist the City of Roseville (City) in planning for its share of housing. The State of California mandates that communities plan for additional housing to meet their "regional housing needs allocation" or (RHNA). An important component of the City's General Plan

Housing Element is the identification of sites for future housing development and an evaluation of the adequacy of these sites in fulfilling the City's share of the RHNA, which is determined by SACOG. The intent of the RHNA is to ensure that local jurisdictions address their fair share of the housing needs for the entire region. Additionally, a major goal of the RHNA is to assure that every community provides an opportunity for a mix of affordable housing to all economic segments of its population. The 2013–2021 RHNA Plan, adopted in September 2012 by SACOG, mandates Roseville's share of the region's housing needs for all income categories as 8,478 additional units. The Amoruso Ranch project would assist the City in providing its share of housing in compliance with state law.

Commercial land uses are incorporated into the project to support the residential needs of the local community, offer employment, and ensure a solid tax base so the City can provide the necessary public services. The types of commercial uses included in the Proposed Action range from neighborhood commercial uses to regional commercial and business park uses.

According to the City, the project site is in an area identified by SACOG as appropriate for growth in SACOG's 2004 "Preferred Blueprint Scenario." In February 2016, in compliance with SB 375, SACOG adopted an SCS in connection with its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for a 2036 time frame. The Preferred Blueprint Scenario was used as the starting point in the development of the SCS. The SCS included land use maps identifying areas that SACOG considered appropriate for development. The Amoruso Ranch property was included in these maps as a future "developing community."

ES.3 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action would implement the Amoruso Ranch project, which includes development of the 674-acre site with a mix of land uses. The master-planned community would include a variety of residential uses, commercial, public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), parks, open space, roadways right-of-ways, and landscape corridors. The Proposed Action also includes adjacent off-site roadway improvements along Sunset Boulevard West to the north and storm water conveyance facilities within the Al Johnson Wildlife Area to the west. The Proposed Action also includes a right-of-way dedication of approximately 49 acres for the future Placer Parkway Regional Transportation Improvement project (Placer Parkway) which is not a part of the development that would be implemented under the Proposed Action. Additionally, the Applicant has put forth a proposed permittee-responsible compensatory wetlands mitigation plan to establish, restore, and/or preserve aquatic resources on three undeveloped parcels just west of the project site and south of Sunset Boulevard West.

In addition to the Proposed Action, this Draft EIS evaluates the environmental effects of four on-site alternatives which include: the No Action; Alternative 1-Southern Avoidance; Alternative 2-Northern Avoidance; and, Alternative 3-Distributed Avoidance. All of the alternatives evaluated in this Draft EIS would also develop a large-scale, mixed-use, master-planned community on the project site. Like the Proposed Action, no other off-site improvements are required to implement the alternatives other than the proposed storm water conveyance facilities in the Al Johnson Wildlife Area and roadway improvements along Sunset Boulevard.

Under the No Action alternative, the project site would be developed in a manner that completely avoids the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into WOUS; thereby, avoiding the need for the Corps to issue a DA permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Alternative 1 or Southern Avoidance alternative would result in a larger southern preserve area, but with a reduced development footprint, and fewer potential impacts to WOUS than the Proposed Action. Alternative 2 or Northern Avoidance alternative would result in a larger northern general open space area, a slightly reduced development footprint, and potentially greater impacts to WOUS than the Proposed Action. Alternative 3 or Distributed Avoidance alternative would result in a larger northern general open space area and development footprint, but greater potential impacts to WOUS, than the Proposed Action. Key attributes of the Proposed Action, alternatives, and potential impacts to WOUS are presented below in **Table ES-1, Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use and WOUS Impacts.**

**Table ES-1
Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use and WOUS Impacts**

Alternative	Development Footprint	Residential Acreage	Residential Units at Buildout	Other Development Acreage		Preserve and Avoidance Acreage	Potential Direct Impacts on WOUS
No Action	316.6	193.2	1,619	Commercial	29.1	305.3	N/A
				Public/Quasi-Public	17.2		
				Parks	12.7		
				Roads ¹	39.5		
				Open Space	21.5		
Proposed Action	517.3	337.2	2,826	Commercial	51.1	107.8	18.70
				Public/Quasi-Public	17.2		
				Parks	22.1		
				Roads ¹	52.0		
				Open Space	37.7		
Alternative 1 - Southern Avoidance	483.7	302.9	2,308	Commercial	52.9	141.6	15.20
				Public/Quasi-Public	17.7		
				Parks	22.3		
				Roads ¹	47.9		
				Open Space	40.0		
Alternative 2 - Northern Avoidance	510.8	327.1	2,417	Commercial	58.0	95.9	22.44
				Public/Quasi-Public	18.0		
				Parks	22.5		
				Roads ¹	50.1		
				Open Space	35.1		

Alternative	Development Footprint	Residential Acreage	Residential Units at Buildout	Other Development Acreage		Preserve and Avoidance Acreage	Potential Direct Impacts on WOUS
Alternative 3 - Distributed Avoidance	528.9	347.9	2,730	Commercial	51.2	91.9	21.84
				Public/Quasi-Public	17.7		
				Parks	22.6		
				Roads ¹	52.1		
				Open Space	37.4		

¹ Includes the area of major roads and landscape corridors.

ES.4 MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

The environmental effects of the No Action alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are summarized in **Table ES-2, Summary of Effects by Major Topics**. A full discussion of the environmental effects is provided in **Chapter 3.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences**. The basis of the impact conclusions summarized in the table are regulatory thresholds for those resource topics for which such thresholds exist, and qualitative thresholds for other resource topics. The significance thresholds are described for each topic in **Chapter 3.0**.

Significant Effects That Cannot Be Mitigated

The No Action alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 3 would have several significant effects that cannot be mitigated, as described below.

Aesthetics

The visual resource analysis in this Draft EIS evaluates the effects of the Proposed Action and the alternatives in terms of loss of scenic views, alterations to the visual character of the area, and the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare. The project site is characterized by gently rolling topography and large, open annual grassland areas. Views of the project site are available from the Toad Hill Ranches residential subdivision and from Sunset Boulevard West.

Implementation of the Proposed Action, including all the alternatives would result in the development of a variety of urban uses, and views of open rangeland would no longer be available from West Sunset Boulevard. In addition to loss of views, the conversion of undeveloped rangeland to urban development under the Proposed Action and the alternatives would significantly modify the visual character of the project site and would add substantial new sources of light and glare on the project site.

No feasible mitigation is available to address the visual effects of the Proposed Action and the alternatives on the scenic vistas and visual character of the project area. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate the light and glare effect but not to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

The air quality assessment addresses the effects of construction- and operation-related emissions of the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives, on the regional and local air quality.

USEPA and California Air Resources Board designate air basins or portions of air basins as being in “attainment” or “nonattainment” for each of the criteria pollutants. Nonattainment areas are ranked (marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme) according to the degree of nonattainment. The Placer County portion of Sacramento Valley Air Basin is designated nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less (PM10), and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or less (PM2.5).

Construction associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x), which are ozone precursors, that would exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) significance thresholds. Thus, they would have a significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation measures would partially mitigate this effect.

Operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM10 from buildout of the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives, are also estimated to exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds for these pollutants, and would have a significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation measures would partially mitigate this effect.

Additionally, the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives, would result in the establishment of sensitive receptors in proximity to existing and future odor sources, including the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP), Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL), Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), industrial land uses, and agricultural uses. The proximity of the project site to odor-generating land uses is closer than the buffer distances recommended in the PCAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook; and thus, they would have a significant effect regarding the exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. No practicable avoidance or minimization measures were identified to address this effect.

Climate Change

The evaluation of climate change effects in this Draft EIS presents the greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives. The impact from operational emissions of GHGs associated with the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives, would be significant. Minimization measures would partially mitigate this effect.

Land Use

The land use assessment addresses the potential for conflict with adopted local plans under the Proposed Action and each of the alternatives. Since the project site will be annexed into the City of Roseville, the applicable plans are the City of Roseville General Plan; the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint; and, the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

Implementation of the Proposed Action, as well as the alternatives, would develop residential land uses at less than the buffer distance recommended by PCAPCD from landfills and WWTPs. This is a significant effect, as sensitive receptors may be exposed to objectionable odors. No practicable avoidance or minimization measures were identified to address this effect.

Noise

The noise analysis in this Draft EIS addresses the potential for noise from construction and operational sources, such as automobile traffic, under the Proposed Action and all the alternatives, which would substantially increase ambient noise to levels that could adversely affect sensitive receptors.

Noise associated with construction of the Proposed Action, as well as each of the alternatives, would result in a significant effect. Minimization measures would reduce construction noise levels; however, noise associated with the construction of the on-site well would occur outside of the hours considered acceptable under the City's Noise Ordinance. Thus, the effect would remain significant. In addition, off-site exterior noise levels due to project traffic under the Proposed Action, as well as the alternatives, would result in a significant effect. Although mitigation is available to reduce this effect, there is no assurance that it would be implemented by the time the impact would occur; therefore, this impact remains significant.

Transportation and Traffic

Traffic associated with the Proposed Action, including all of the alternatives, would result in significant effects on five intersections in Roseville and/or Placer County. Although minimization measures are available that would require that the proposed development pay its fair share of the cost of necessary improvements to the affected intersections, there is uncertainty regarding the feasibility of the measures. Therefore, even with minimization measures, indirect effects on these intersections would remain significant.

Traffic as a result of implementing the Proposed Action, or any of the alternatives, would result in significant effects on two segments of State Route (SR) 65, which would already be deficient without the traffic added by the Proposed Action, or alternatives, in 2035. Minimization measures are available to reduce this effect; however, the Corps does not have the authority or jurisdiction to require state highway facilities improvements. Therefore, there is no guarantee that such improvements would be implemented by the time the impact would occur. Thus, effects on traffic under the Proposed Action, as well as each alternative, would remain significant.

Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The following cumulative effects are associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Aesthetics

The Proposed Action, as well as each alternative, would have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and the visual character of the project vicinity by altering views of open rangeland, foothills, and Sierra Nevada, and by converting undeveloped rangeland to urban development as viewed from, Sunset

Boulevard West. Development of the project site and the surrounding area, pursuant to Creekview Specific Plan, Westbrook project, and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, would permanently alter the visual character of the area, both under daytime conditions and at night. The Proposed Action, including each alternative, would introduce new sources of light and glare. When added to the effects of other future developments in the vicinity, this would result in a significant cumulative effect on aesthetics. No practicable minimization measures under the Proposed Action or any of the alternatives were identified that would avoid this cumulative effect on visual resources.

Air Quality

The project site is located in an area that is designated non-attainment for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. As noted above, operational emissions from buildout of the Proposed Action, as well as the alternatives, are estimated to exceed Air District thresholds for ROG and NO_x (ozone precursors), and PM₁₀.

Future air quality conditions are anticipated to improve over time within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin due to improvements in emissions controls and the use of cleaner fuels and alternate energy, and full buildout of the Proposed Action would not result in a lack of conformity with approved federal air quality plans or the SIP. In February 2016, the SACOG reached a favorable conformity determination in approving the latest MTP/SCS. As described in **Chapter 1.0**, the SCS, formulated pursuant to Senate Bill 375, assumed full development of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan area. Since buildout of all land uses assumed in the SCS would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable federal air quality plans or the SIP, the same would be true of the buildout of the Proposed Action. Consequently, emissions associated with operation and occupancy of the Proposed Action and buildout of cumulative development would not cause direct adverse effects on the region's ability to achieve compliance with air quality standards. Compliance with the City's Transportation Systems Management Ordinance and implementation of proposed minimization measures would reduce the amount of emissions generated by the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would also be subject to a variety of policies that would promote the use of alternative forms of transportation and pedestrian access to commercial and office uses within the project site. However, because the operational air emissions associated with the Proposed Action are not accounted for in regional air quality attainment plans, even with mitigation, the emissions would be considered significant and the Proposed Action would make a significant contribution to the cumulative impact on regional air quality.

Additionally, the No Action alternative and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would develop large-scale communities similar to or smaller in size than the Proposed Action, of which, cumulative effects on air quality would be generally similar to that of the Proposed Action. Therefore, despite implementation of mitigating measures, operational emissions from all alternatives would result in a significant contribution to the cumulative impact on air quality.

Noise

Cumulative traffic, including traffic associated with the Proposed Action or any of the alternatives, would increase ambient noise levels along off-site roadways. However, the increase would not be substantial along all off-site roadways, except along Sunset Boulevard West between Amoruso Way and Westbrook

Boulevard. Although mitigation is available to reduce this significant effect, the roadway is not within the Corps authority or jurisdiction; thus, implementation of the mitigating measure cannot be guaranteed and the Proposed Action's, or an alternative's contribution to this cumulative impact would remain significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water demand associated with buildout of the City's General Plan and the Proposed Action would be supplied by existing and assured sources of water. As a matter of policy, the City of Roseville will not approve new specific plans or other projects absent sufficient water for buildout of such plans and projects. Nonetheless, any increase in water demand in a region that does not have adequate and assured water supplies for cumulative development has the potential to result in a significant cumulative effect on water resources. No mitigation measures within the Corps' control are available to address these potentially significant cumulative effects. Therefore, the contribution of the Proposed Action and alternatives to cumulative effects on water supply would be significant.

ES.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Areas of Controversy

NEPA regulations (40 CFR Section 1502.12) require that a summary of an EIS identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the Notice of Intent, with the exception of a comment letter from the USEPA, no comment letters were received regarding the project. There are no areas of potential controversy known to the Corps or the Applicant.

The August 4, 2016, letter from the USEPA contained comments requesting a comprehensive alternatives analysis, in compliance with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. USEPA also requested a detailed analysis of the Proposed Action's effects on water supply, groundwater, biological resources, air quality, traffic, and climate change. All of USEPA's comments were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIS.

Issues to be Resolved

The Corps will need to determine whether to issue or deny a DA permit for the Proposed Action pursuant to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

ES.6 INTENDED USES OF THE EIS

This EIS will be used by the Corps in exercising its decision-making authority under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Mitigation Measure AES-4c: Avoid Light Spill Over into University Creek and Open Space Areas <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>Outdoor lighting shall be placed, designed, and directed so as to avoid light spillover into the habitat of University Creek, Open Space Preserve Areas, and the Al Johnson Wildlife Area. These parcels include those immediately adjacent to the open space and shown on the Land Use Map as parcels, AR-3, AR-4, AR-7, AR-8, AR-11, AR-20, AR-24, AR-37, AR-56, AR-57, AR-60, and AR-63.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of building permits for all phases</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			
<p>Cumulative Impact AES-1: Effect on Visual Resources PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is feasible.</p>	S	S	S
<p><i>Agricultural Resources</i></p>			
<p>Impact AG-1: Conversion of Agricultural Land NE(m) NE(m) NE(m)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AG-1: Agricultural Compensation <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>One acre of open space shall be preserved within Placer County for each acre of agricultural/grazing land impacted within the Specific Plan area. This is to be accomplished through the recordation of conservation easements that result in the formation of preserve lands (each a “mitigation property or “preserve site” and collectively, “mitigation lands” or “preserve lands”). For purposes of mitigation, the term “open space” shall include any and all undeveloped land proposed to be preserved by conservation easement or otherwise required by any governmental agency to be preserved for any reason, specifically including all lands preserved for habitat or agricultural mitigation as set forth below and lands in agricultural use. No additional agricultural mitigation is required beyond the 1:1 open space requirement noted above, as long as a substantial portion of the mitigation lands acquired, as determined by the Planning Director, are: (1) in agricultural production, (2) are undeveloped and have an NRCS soils classification of the same or greater value than lands being affected within the Specific Plan (i.e., Amoruso Ranch project) property at issue, or (3) are undeveloped and have the same or higher value California Department of Conservation categorization as lands being affected within the specific plan property at issue. In-kind mitigation is not required for agricultural land developed within the ARSP project site.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of final maps</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Impact AG-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Agricultural Uses PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required	NE	NE	NE
Cumulative Impact AG-1: Conversion of Important Farmland PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measure AG-1.	NS(m)	NS(m)	NS(m)
<i>Air Quality</i>			
Impact AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Construction Mitigation Measure AQ-1:	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
Dust and Construction Control Measures <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i>			
<i>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce short-term construction-related air quality impacts.</i>			
<p>a) <i>Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, (whichever occurs first), on project sites greater than five acres, the Applicant shall submit to PCAPCD a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan within 30 days prior to groundbreaking. If the PCAPCD does not respond within 20 days, the plan shall be considered approved. The Applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by the PCAPCD, to the City that the plan has been submitted to PCAPCD. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to deliver the approved plan to the local jurisdiction. The Applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving District approval of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit, unless the PCAPCD does not respond within 20 days of submission of the plan, and the plan is deemed approved.</i></p> <p>b) <i>The following shall be included in the Dust Control Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>During construction, emissions of fugitive dust from any active operation, open storage pile, or disturbed surface area, shall be controlled so that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the boundary line of the emission source.</i> • <i>When wind speeds result in dust emissions crossing the property line, and despite the application of dust control measures, grading and earthmoving operations shall be suspended and inactive disturbed surface areas shall be stabilized.</i> • <i>Fugitive dust generated by active operations, open storage piles, or from a disturbed surface area shall not result in such opacity as to obscure an observer’s view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke as dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart (or 40 percent opacity).</i> • <i>All exposed soils be watered a minimum of once every two hours of active operation or sufficiently often to keep the area adequately wetted.</i> • <i>Any visible track-out on a paved road where vehicles enter and exit the work area must be removed at the end of the workday or at least on time per day. Removal shall be accomplished by using wet sweeping or a HEPA filter equipped vacuum device. Dirt from vehicles exiting shall be removed through the use of a gravel pad, a tire shaker, a wheel wash system, or a pavement extending for not less than 50 feet from the intersection with the paved public road.</i> 			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
	<p>c) <i>Include the following standard note on the Grading or Improvement Plan: The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the PCAPCD prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name and phone number of the property owner, project manager and on-site foreman.</i></p> <p>d) <i>Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the Applicant shall provide a written calculation to the PCAPCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or greater) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction as required by CARB. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.</i></p> <p>e) <i>In order to control dust, operational watering trucks shall be on-site during construction hours. In addition, dry, mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Watering of a construction site shall be carried out in compliance with all pertinent PCAPCD rules (or as required by ordinance within each local jurisdiction).</i></p> <p>f) <i>Include the following standard notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.</i> • <i>During construction the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.</i> <p>g) <i>Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling time is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville; Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>		

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Occupancy/Operation</p>	<p>S(m)</p>	<p>S(m)</p>	<p>S(m)</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2a:</p>	<p>Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</p>		
<p><i>Following receipt of an application for a Tentative Maps (excluding the large lot subdivision map), Design Review Permit, conditional use permits and/or all discretionary permits, the City will forward an early consultation notice to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPD). Where the PCAPD provides comments on a specific development proposal, the City shall consult with the PCAPD and the developer to incorporate measures recommended by the PCAPD and agreed to by the City into the project. Where the PCAPD does not provide comment on a specific development proposal, the City shall incorporate measures that reduce vehicle emissions and operation emissions from the proposed development. This measure will be implemented through project design, conditions of approval, noticing and disclosure statements, or through the City’s plan check and inspection processes. This process is intended to ensure that best available and practical approaches are used to reduce operational emissions in specific tentative map and design review permit applications. The following is a listing of measures that shall be implemented for the purpose of reducing vehicle and operational emissions, unless the Applicant provides an analysis that demonstrates to the City’s satisfaction that the measure is infeasible or other measure is comparably effective. If the Applicant demonstrates that any particular measure in the list below is infeasible for a proposed project to which it would otherwise be applicable, the Applicant must provide an analysis supported by substantial evidence demonstrating that a replacement measure is comparably effective.</i></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide tree plantings that meet or exceed the requirements of the City’s Community Design Guidelines to provide shading of buildings and parking lots.</i> • <i>Landscape with native drought-resistant plants (ground covers, shrubs and trees) with particular consideration of plantings that are not reliant on gas-powered landscape maintenance equipment.</i> • <i>Require all flat roofs on non-residential structures to have a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demand.</i> • <i>Provide conductive/inductive electric vehicle charging station and signage prohibiting parking for non-electric vehicles within designated spaces within non-residential developments.</i> • <i>Provide vanpool parking only spaces and preferential parking for carpools to accommodate carpools and vanpools in employment areas (e.g. community commercial, business-professional uses)</i> • <i>All truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208 volt power outlet for every two-dock doors. Signs shall be posted stating “Diesel trucks are prohibited from idling more than 5 minutes and trucks requiring auxiliary power shall connect to the 110/208-vot outlets to run auxiliary equipment.”</i> • <i>Design streets to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops.</i> • <i>Require site design to maximize access to transit lines, to accommodate bus travel, and to provide lighted shelters at transit access points.</i> • <i>Develop the plan consistent with the higher residential densities (within approved residential density ranges of zone) provided around the village nodes and transit corridors.</i> • <i>Participate in Roseville Electric incentive programs for energy-efficient development where feasible if available at the time of construction.</i> 			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten percent of the residential units shall be designated as low to very-low income residential units. • A pedestrian access network shall link areas of the project site with other land uses. • Electric landscape maintenance equipment shall be utilized to the extent feasible on parks and public/quasi-public lands. • Design buildings to meet the 2016 Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards. • Ensure that all area lighting installed on the site shall be considered high efficiency lighting. All public street lighting shall meet the lighting standards of Roseville Electric at the time of construction. • Utilize reclaimed water for irrigation of all non-single family areas within the project site, including the school, parks, paseos, roadway landscaping and commercial landscaping. • Reduce the area of turf allowed consistent with the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and the Water Conservation Strategy (see Appendix G). • Install water efficient landscape irrigation systems at all public land uses. <p>Measures for Residential Units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require electrical outlets be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of residences to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment. • Require every garage of each single family home to be considered “Electric Vehicle Ready.” This by definition is not limited to, but includes a conduit raceway to a spare electric box in the garage that is sized for a future minimum 50-amp 220v outlet. A 220v breaker space must be available in the electrical panel. • Require installation of a gas outlet in the rear of residential buildings for use of outdoor cooking appliances, such as gas burning barbeques. • Require installation of low nitrogen oxide (NOx) hot water heaters (beyond District Rule 246 requirements). • Prior to approval of Tentative Maps: provide notice to homebuyers through CC&Rs or other mechanisms to inform them that only gas fireplaces are permitted. • The Applicant shall ensure that builders offer only energy efficient appliances for installation in residential units, including Energy Star refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans. • Prior to building permit approval, the Applicant shall show, on the plans submitted to the Building Department, provisions for construction of new residences, and where natural gas is available, the installation of a gas outlet for use with outdoor cooking appliances, such as a gas barbecue or outdoor recreational fire pits. 		

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2b:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Off-site Mitigation for Operational Emissions (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of building permits by the City, in order to mitigate the contribution to long-term emissions of pollutants, subject to the PCAPCD’s review and approval, the Applicant shall either:</p> <p>a) Establish mitigation on-site by incorporating design features within the project. This may include, but not be limited to: “green” building features such solar panels, energy efficient heating and cooling, exceeding Title 24 standards, bike lanes, bus shelters, etc. as described in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3. The specific amounts of “credits” received shall be established and coordinated through the PCACPD;</p> <p>b) Establish mitigation off-site within the same region (i.e., east or west Placer County) by participating in an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the District. Examples include, but are not limited to: participation in a “Biomass” program that provides emissions benefits; retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., buses, construction equipment, on road haulers); or other programs that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions;</p> <p>c) Participate in the District’s Offsite Mitigation Program (Resolution Number 01-06) by paying fees equal to the project’s contribution of pollutants (ROG and NOx) in excess of the threshold of 55 lbs per day. The estimated payment for the Proposed Project is 885,870 based on a rate of \$18,260 per ton for a one year period. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied pursuant to current California Air Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map or issuance of Building Permits; or</p> <p>d) Any combination of a, b, or c, calculated to reduce or off-set the project’s emissions above thresholds, and as determined feasible by the Director of the PCAPCD.</p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville; Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>			
<p>Impact AQ-3: CO Hotspots</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact AQ-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Screen Health Risks <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p>a) <i>The siting of proposed land use types, including fueling facilities and other stationary source/industrial land use types, within the project site shall meet the minimum screening buffer recommendations within the applicable CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook in effect at the time of building permit issuance. Within the current (April 2005) Handbook, this would require that sensitive land uses, including residential and school uses, be located greater than 50 feet from the fence line of typical gas dispensing facilities, and greater than 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities, defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater.</i></p> <p>b) <i>For projects that include stationary sources of air pollutants or TACs e.g., gasoline dispensing facility, auto painting, dry cleaning, large heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units, etc.), a copy of the Authority to Construct permit from PCAPCD shall be provided to the City prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville; Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact AQ-5: Exposure to Objectionable Odors</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is feasible.</p>	S	S	S
<p>Cumulative Impact AQ-1: Effects from Criteria Pollutant Emissions</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and AQ-2.</p>	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
<i>Aquatic Resources</i>			
<p>Impact AR-1: Loss or Degradation of Aquatic Resources Functions and Services through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption or Other Means</p> <p>NA</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE(m)	NE	NE(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Mitigation Measure AR-1a:</p>	<p>Compensatory Mitigation for the Unavoidable Loss of Potential Waters of the U.S., including Wetlands <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the approval of the Record of Decision for the Proposed Action or an alternative, and in order to mitigate for the unavoidable loss of potential waters of the U.S., including wetlands, the Applicant, in accordance with the mitigation preference hierarchy outlined in 33 CFR § 332.3(b), shall purchase compensatory mitigation credits from a Corps approved mitigation bank or In-lieu Fee (ILF) Program, and/or develop a permittee-responsible mitigation and monitoring plan, consistent with Title 33 CFR § 332.4-7 and presented in the format of current guidance (e.g., Regional Compensatory Mitigation and Monitoring Guidelines for the South Pacific Division, dated January 12, 2015, and Regulatory Guidance Letter, dated October 10, 2008). Compensatory mitigation shall be implemented prior to or concurrent with the occurrence of impacts. The Corps approved mitigation bank or ILF Program shall be located within Placer County and shall include the project site within its service area. In addition, in order to reduce cumulative impacts on aquatic resources within the watershed, the Applicant shall attempt to identify and utilize a mitigation bank located within the same watershed as the proposed impacts. The Applicant shall provide written justification demonstrating why the use of permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation is environmentally preferable to a mitigation bank or ILF Program if the proposed impact site is within the service area of a Corps approved mitigation bank or ILF Program, and the mitigation bank and ILF Program has the appropriate number and type of aquatic resource credits available (33 CFR § 332.3(b)).</i></p> <p><i>Within the Record of Decision for the Proposed Action, the Corps shall document its determination regarding the appropriate amount and type of compensatory mitigation required to ensure no net loss of aquatic resource functions and services, based on a number of factors, including: the functions of the resources being impacted; the difficulty of replacing the specific resource; uncertainty and risk of failure; and, indirect impacts and temporal loss.</i></p>		
<p>Mitigation Measure AR-1b:</p>	<p>Preservation of On-Site and Off-Site Wetlands and Other Potential Waters of the U.S. <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>Avoided wetlands and other potential waters of the U.S., including vegetated buffers, within the Southeast and Southwest Preserves on the project site shall be placed into separate “preserve” parcels prior to commencing authorized activities. Prior to the Record of Decision for the Proposed Action or an alternative, the Applicant shall develop and submit to the Corps, for review and approval, a specific and detailed preserve management plan for the on- and/or off-site preservation areas. The plan shall describe in detail any activities that are proposed within the preserve areas and the long-term funding and maintenance and monitoring of each of the preserve areas. The Applicant shall install temporary fencing around preserved wetlands to avoid inadvertent impacts from ongoing construction near preserved wetlands. No roads, utility lines, outfalls, trails, benches, firebreaks or other structures shall be constructed within the on- and/or off-site preserve areas, unless specifically approved in writing by the Corps. Any preserve areas, located within the City of Roseville, shall be subject to management by the City of Roseville under the City’s OSPOMP.</i></p> <p><i>Within the Record of Decision for the Proposed Action or an alternative, the Corps shall document its determination on whether on- and/or off-site preservation is an appropriate method of compensatory mitigation to offset unavoidable impacts to aquatic resources as a result of authorized activities. If the Corps determines that on- and/or off-site preservation of aquatic resources is appropriate compensatory mitigation, the Corps will determine the amount and type of preservation required to ensure no net loss of aquatic resource functions and services, based on a number of factors, including the functions of the resources being impacted, the difficulty of replacing the specific resource, uncertainty and risk of failure, indirect impacts, and temporal loss. Long-term operations and management plans for on- and/or off-site preservation areas shall include requirements for site protection, the implementation of appropriate financial assurances, and monitoring of the preserve areas in accordance with applicable Corps regulations and guidance.</i></p> <p>Timing: Prior to commencing construction activities and/or work in WOUS, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)</p>		

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Cumulative Impact AR-1: Loss of Potential Waters of the U.S., including Vernal Pool Invertebrate Habitat PA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measures AR-1a, AR-1b, and CUM AR-1. Mitigation Measure CUM AR-1: Compensatory Mitigation for the loss of potential WOUS <i>(Applicability – All future development in the Study Area)</i></p> <p><i>For proposed discharges of dredged and/or fill material into potential WOUS within the study area, the Corps will, in general, require at a minimum, 1:1 mitigation for each acre of aquatic resources lost for all future losses authorized under Department of the Army permits. The Corps will factor into its mitigation requirements the risk of mitigation failure or uncertainty of success and the temporal loss of function.</i></p> <p>Timing: Prior to commencing construction activities and/or work in WOUS, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)</p>	NS(m)	NE	NS(m)
Biological Resources			
<p>Impact BIO-1: Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Their Habitat Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates <i>(Applicability – No Action)</i></p> <p><i>No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates until a Section 10 general permit has been issued by the USFWS.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Implement Permit Conditions <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates until a biological opinion (BO) and incidental take statement has been issued by the USFWS. The Corps will consult with the USFWS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and if the Corps determines DA permits will be issued for impacts to habitat on the project site, the BO conditions shall be incorporated into the terms and conditions of the DA permits. The Applicant shall abide by permit conditions (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction.</i></p> <p>Timing: Prior to commencing construction activities and/or work in WOUS, as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact BIO-2: Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species NA No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Federal Special-status Plant Measures <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to federal special-status plant species:</i></p> <p>a) <i>If federally listed plant species are found within the project site, avoidance zones shall be established around plant populations to clearly demarcate areas for avoidance. Avoidance measures and buffer distances may vary between species and the specific avoidance zone distance will be determined in coordination with appropriate resource agencies (USFWS).</i></p> <p>b) <i>If federally listed plant species are found within the project site and avoidance of the species is not possible, then additional measures such as seed collection and/or transplanted shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies (USFWS).</i></p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of any grading, improvement, or construction plans and before any ground-disturbing activity in any project development phase that contains vernal pools or other seasonal wetland habitats.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE	NE(m)
<p>Impact BIO-3: Effects on Federally Listed Amphibian and Reptile Species PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact BIO-4: Effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact BIO-5: Effects on Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact BIO-6: Effects on State Special-Status Plant Species</p> <p>NA</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Special-status Plant Measures <i>(Applicability –Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to state special-status plant species:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) A qualified botanist or biologist shall collect source pool inoculum from the two vernal pools containing dwarf downingia and shall transfer the soil inoculum to an approved off-site location. A botanist or qualified biologist shall determine which vernal pools will provide the best suitable habitat. Transferred inoculum into created and/or restored wetlands shall require monitoring, in accordance with Section 404 permit guidelines or other City/CDFW approved mitigation plan.</i> <i>b) Perform focused special-status plant surveys according to CDFW and CNPS protocols (CDFW, 2000; CNPS, 2001; Cypher, 2002) for the three off-site Mitigation Properties. Surveys shall be timed according to the blooming period for target species and known reference populations will be visited prior to surveys to confirm the species is blooming where known to occur</i> <i>c) If no special-status plants are found, no further measures pertaining to special-status plants are necessary.</i> <i>d) If special-status plant species are found within the project site, avoidance zones shall be established around plant populations to clearly demarcate areas for avoidance. Avoidance measures and buffer distances may vary between species and the specific avoidance zone distance will be determined in coordination with appropriate resource agencies (CDFW).</i> <i>e) If special-status plant species are found within the project site and avoidance of the species is not possible, then additional measures such as seed collection and/or transplantation shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies (CDFW).</i> <p>Timing: Before the approval of any grading, improvement, or construction plans and before any ground-disturbing activity in any project development phase that contains vernal pools or other seasonal wetland habitats.</p> <p>Enforcement: California Department of Fish and Wildlife; City of Roseville</p>	<p>NE(m)</p>	<p>NE</p>	<p>NE(m)</p>

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>b) Burrowing Owl: Burrowing owls were detected within the project site during surveys. To minimize impacts to protected burrowing owls and their burrows, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If possible, initiate construction activities during the non-breeding season, September 1 through January 31. - A qualified biologist shall conduct a take avoidance (pre-construction) burrowing owl survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction of the project site and all accessible areas within 492 feet of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity, according to the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012). If no burrowing owls or sign are observed, construction may proceed. - If burrowing owls or signs of owls are found, avoidance setbacks shall be implemented in accordance with CDFW Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012). - If avoidance setbacks are infeasible, the qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW, and prepare and implement a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan that will include passive relocation according to protocol outlined in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW, 2012). If passive relocation methods are employed, the project impact site shall be rendered inhospitable for further burrowing owl re-occupation in accordance with the Exclusion Plan. <p>c) Swainson's Hawk: Swainson's hawks have been found nesting on the adjacent CSP Area to the south of the project site (City of Roseville, 2011a). To minimize impacts to protected Swainson's hawks and their nests, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If possible, initiate site construction activities during the non-breeding season, September 1 through February 28. - A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction of the project site and all accessible areas within 0.5 mile of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (March 1 through August 31). - If no active Swainson's hawk nests are found, no further measures pertaining to Swainson's hawk nests are necessary. - If active nests are found, the qualified biologist shall monitor the active nests for the first 24 hours prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in accordance with CDFW's recommendations. - Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction within the project site. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures. - Pre-construction Swainson's hawk nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season. 			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>d) California Black Rail: There is no potential California black rail habitat with the project site. However, surveys or habitat assessments for this species have not been performed within the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area. To ensure that there are no impacts to California black rail, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment of the off-site Al Johnson Wildlife Area improvements area to identify suitable California black rail habitat. The qualified biologist shall prepare a map identifying areas that support suitable habitat. - If suitable habitat is within areas proposed for construction during the breeding season (February 1 through July 31), the qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for the California black rail. Three surveys shall be conducted at least seven days apart during peak calling times (one half hour before dawn until three hours after, and three hours before sunset until one half hour after) using playback of taped breeding calls. The last survey shall occur within 14 days of the start of construction. - If no California black rail is detected, no further measures pertaining to this species are necessary. - If a California black rail is detected, impacts shall be avoided by establishing an appropriate buffer, as determined by the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the rail has evacuated the area. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist and confirmed by CDFW; buffer size may vary, depending on the nest location, nest stage, and construction activity. <p>e) Nuttall’s Woodpecker, Loggerhead Shrike, Yellow-billed Magpie, Oak Titmouse, and Grasshopper Sparrow: The project site supports potential nesting habitat for one special-status woodpecker and five special-status passerine bird species: Nuttall’s woodpecker (USFWS conservation concern), loggerhead shrike (USFWS conservation concern and CDFW SSC), yellow-billed magpie (USFWS conservation concern), oak titmouse (USFWS conservation concern), and grasshopper sparrow (CDFW SSC). To ensure that there are no impacts to protected active nests of these species, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction within the project site and all accessible areas within 50 feet of the limits of construction within 14 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (Nuttall’s woodpecker, March-July; loggerhead shrike, March- May; yellow-billed magpie, late February-mid-July; oak titmouse, March-July; grasshopper sparrow, May-July). - If no active special-status bird nests are found, no further measures pertaining to special-status birds are necessary. - If active nests are found, the active nests will be monitored by a qualified biologist prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. - Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction of the proposed project. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures. - Pre-construction bird nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season. 			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>f) Migratory Bird Treaty Act Birds: Many birds, including commonly occurring species, are protected under the California Fish and Game Code and the Federal MBTA. To ensure that there are no impacts to protected birds or their active nests, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of all suitable habitats within the limits of construction within the project site and all accessible areas within 50 feet of the limits of construction within 3 days of the initiation of construction activity during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). If there is a break in construction activity of more than 2 weeks then subsequent surveys should be conducted; however no additional surveys are required for ongoing construction activities. - If no protected birds are found, no further measures pertaining to protected birds are necessary. - If active nests are found, a qualified biologist shall monitor the active nests prior to any construction-related activity to establish a behavioral baseline. A no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. The exclusionary buffer shall remain in place until the chicks have fledged or as otherwise determined by a qualified biologist. - Once construction activities commence on-site, all nests will be monitored by a qualified biologist to detect any behavioral changes as a result of construction of the Proposed Project. If behavioral changes are observed that may result in adverse effects to the success of breeding, the work causing that change shall cease and consultation with CDFW shall be initiated to identify potential avoidance and minimization measures. Should construction activities cause observed stress to nesting birds, the exclusionary buffer shall be adjusted (e.g. increased) based on findings of a qualified biologist. - Pre-construction bird nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside the nesting season. <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Preservation of Grassland Habitat (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</p> <p>CDFW recommends that projects that result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk (which includes grasslands) within 10-miles of an active nest site provide mitigation for that loss. To the extent feasible, strategies for preserving on-site grasslands as raptor and migratory bird foraging habitat shall be addressed in the City’s OSPOMP, the Applicant’s permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation plan pursuant to a Section 404 Permit, or other applicable CDFW approved plan. Some of these strategies could include; but are not necessarily limited to, grazing for grassland management, monitoring for biological values, and adaptive management. Mitigation for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat would concurrently mitigate for loss of habitat for a number of other bird species in the region such as burrowing owl, red-tailed hawk, white-tailed kite, northern harrier, Ferruginous hawk, and loggerhead shrike among others.</p> <p>A Swainson’s Hawk Grassland Habitat Mitigation Plan shall be developed to mitigate for the loss of foraging habitat. Therefore, under the Proposed Action, the Applicant shall preserve no less than 595.7 acres of grassland and agricultural foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk and approximately 91.4 acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat shall be maintained and preserved onsite. The remainder of the mitigation shall be accomplished via the preservation of 499.9 acres of grassland communities within the three off-site mitigation properties, which will offset the loss of foraging habitat pursuant to the CDFW established formula for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat replacement.</p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; City of Roseville; California Department of Fish and Wildlife</p>			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact BIO-9: Effects on State Special-Status Bats</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Protection of Bat Roosting Sites <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p>To ensure that there are no impacts to active bat roosts, the following mitigation measures are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A qualified biologist shall conduct a dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last three hours), followed by a pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for two hours), in addition a daytime visual inspection of all potential bat roosting habitat within the limits of construction within the project site, as well as the three off-site mitigation properties, included as part of the pre-construction clearance survey. If no active bat roosts or sign are observed, construction may proceed. b) If no active special-species bat roosts are found, no further measures pertaining to special-species bats are necessary. c) If roosting special-species bats are found on- or off-site during the surveys, avoid direct and indirect impacts to roosting sites by establishing a no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet around roost sites, in consultation with CDFW. d) Clearing and grubbing adjacent to the roost site and lighting use near the roost site where it would shine on the roost or interfere with bats entering or leaving the roost shall be prohibited. e) Operation of internal combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps, and vehicles within 100 feet of the roost site shall be prohibited. <p>Timing: Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville; California Department of Fish and Wildlife</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact BIO-10: Effects on Wildlife Movement</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Wildlife Movement <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p>To protect the long-term quality of habitat along the University Creek stream channel and associated riparian corridor as for use as wildlife movement and migration corridors, the Applicant shall ensure that movement corridors are not obstructed. Through compliance with Section 1600 of the CDFW Code, the Applicant(s) shall enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to conducting any construction activities within the stream corridor, which sets forth mitigation measures that the Applicant must implement. These measures shall include, but not be limited to, the use of a bridge and/or culvert for the road crossing that is large enough that wildlife have enough space to pass without having to travel over the road surface, the implementation of bank stabilization measures, and/or restoration and revegetation of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged due to the project’s construction. The road crossing feature shall be constructed in a configuration as to provide wildlife with unimpeded passage. Furthermore, recreational use trails shall be lined by post and rail fence and signage shall be posted to direct trail users to stay within the designated trail corridor. The trails shall be closed to use one-half hour after sunset to one-half hour before sunrise and shall not be illuminated.</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Timing: Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville; California Department of Fish and Wildlife</p>			
<p>Impact BIO-11: Loss of Riparian Habitat PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-10.</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Cumulative Impact BIO-1: Loss of Annual Grassland PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measures AR-1a and BIO-8b</p>	NS(m)	NS(m)	NS(m)
<p>Cumulative Impact BIO-2: Effects on Wildlife Foraging and Movement Habitat</p> <p>Mitigation Measure CUM BIO-2 Vernal Pool Grassland Habitat Mitigation (Applicability – All future development in the Study Area)</p> <p><i>The USACE will work with the study area cities and Placer County to encourage regional and local planning efforts, such as the SACOG Blueprint and the proposed PCCP, that are designed to focus and concentrate growth in certain portions of the study area, minimize future loss of wetlands and vernal pool grassland habitat within the study area, and compensate for unavoidable losses.</i></p> <p>Timing: Ongoing</p> <p>Enforcement: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)</p>	NS(m)	NS(m)	NS(m)
<p><i>Climate Change</i></p>			
<p>Impact GHG-1: GHG Emissions due to Construction PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1.</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact GHG-2: GHG Emissions due to Operation/Occupancy PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2.</p>	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
Impact CR-1: Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Discovery of Cultural Resources during Construction (No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)			
<p><i>Should any cultural resources (e.g., wells, foundations, or debris, or unusual amounts of bone, stone or shell, artifacts, burned or baked soils, charcoal, or human remains) be encountered during subsurface excavation or construction activities, all work within a 100-foot radius of the discovery shall be suspended and the Corps shall be immediately notified. At that time, a qualified professional archaeologist shall assess the resource and provide recommendations for treatment if the resource appears to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or a significant cultural resource under NEPA. Potential mitigation options or treatment recommendations could include, but are not be limited to, avoidance, construction monitoring, recordation, site testing, or data recovery excavations. The permittee shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by the Corps, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, to avoid and/or minimize adverse effects to cultural resources, prior to resuming work within the no-work radius.</i></p>			
Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Discovery of Human Remains during Construction (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)			
<p><i>If human remains are uncovered during project construction, pursuant to California Public Resource Code (PRC) § 5097.98 and § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, the Placer County Coroner shall be notified immediately. California law recognizes the need to protect interred human remains, particularly Native American burials, from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of discovered human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and PRC §5097. If human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all such activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall be suspended and Placer County Coroner shall be notified immediately by the permittee or representative. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code § 7050.5[b]). If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code § 7050[c]). Upon being notified, the Corps shall contact the Most Likely Descendent (MLD), as determined by the NAHC, regarding the remains. The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (PRC § 5097.94). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (PRC § 5097.98). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the Corps, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.</i></p>			
<p>Timing: Before the approval of all grading plans and construction, and throughout project construction.</p>			
<p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Cumulative Impact CR-1: Damage to Historic Properties or Human Remains PA, NA, A1 through 3 Implement Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b.	NS(m)	NS(m)	NS(m)
<i>Environmental Justice</i>			
Impact EJ-1: Disproportionate Adverse Environmental Effects on Minority or Low-income Populations PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact EJ-2: Effect on Population and Housing PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
<i>Geology, Soils, and Minerals</i>			
Impact GEO-1: Hazard Associated with Seismic Ground-Shaking PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact GEO-2: Hazard Associated with Liquefaction PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact GEO-3: Hazard Associated with Slope Failure PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact GEO-4: Potential Structural Damage due to Expansive Soils PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact GEO-5: Effect on Mineral Resources PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1: Exposure to Soil or Groundwater Contamination from Past Uses	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Identify and Remediate Soil Contamination and Existing Hazardous Materials within the Project Site (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)			
<p><i>As a condition of approval of the ARSP (i.e., Amoruso Ranch project), the following recommendations from the Phase I ESA for the project site (ENGE0 2006) shall be completed prior to issuance of grading permits:</i></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Stained soil observed beneath one of the 5-gallon buckets used to store Tech 2000 Mineral Gear Oil shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.</i> <i>b) Stained soil measuring approximately 1 foot in diameter beneath one of the aboveground fuel storage tanks next to the steel silo in the northern portion of the property shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.</i> <i>c) The 21 55-gallon steel drums near the farm facility shall be removed and properly disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility.</i> <i>d) A statistically significant number of soil samples shall be collected from the surface soil within the boundaries of the proposed school site and analyzed for agricultural chemicals per USEPA guidelines.</i> <i>e) Should the results indicate the presence of a statistically significant concentration of agricultural chemicals with the potential to cause harm to sensitive receptors (such as school children), a Phase II ESA shall be conducted to determine the extent of the contamination and provide recommendation to remediate the school site. In consultation with DTSC, the proponent of the school development shall develop a workplan based on the recommendations of the Phase II ESA to remediate the project site.</i> <i>f) Debris at various locations across the project site shall be removed and properly disposed of.</i> <i>g) The burned wood pile, measuring approximately 500 feet long by 6 feet tall by 6 feet wide, along the southern portion of the project site shall be removed prior to construction at the project site.</i> <i>h) If evidence of further soil contamination, septic tanks, or other underground storage tanks are encountered in the project site, work shall cease until the area can be tested by a qualified professional meeting USEPA’s definition of an Environmental Professional under the “All Appropriate Inquiries Rule” in accordance with CERCLA. The qualified professional shall provide recommendations for further remediation in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. If necessary, contaminated materials shall be removed and properly disposed or remediated, and regulatory site closure obtained. Remediation activities could include removal of contaminated soil, and/or treatment. The City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities are coordinated with the RFD, PCDEH, and if needed, other appropriate federal, state and local agencies. Once a site is remediated to the satisfaction of the appropriate regulatory agency, construction can continue.</i> 			
<p>Timing: During project construction.</p>			
<p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact HAZ-2: Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact HAZ-3: Risk related to Use of Recycled Water PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>			
<p>Impact HYDRO-1: Effect related to On- or Off-Site Flood Hazards Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Erosion Monitoring Plan <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>At the onset of any grading activities within the project site that increase the existing drainage area tributary to the University Creek channel within Al Johnson Wildlife Area, a geomorphologic assessment of University Creek through the Al Johnson Wildlife Area property shall be conducted.</i></p> <p><i>The geomorphologic assessment shall include erosion protection measures, such as stream bank stabilization and velocity reduction measures, and the location for their implementation. The construction of the erosion protection measures shall be triggered by criteria established within the geomorphologic assessment.</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b: Fair Share Payment to Regional Storm Water Retention <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant shall annex into the fee district and pay the Pleasant Grove Watershed Mitigation fee to the City prior to the approval of each building permit, which would cover the cost of retention for that development's portion of the Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Project at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before the approval of each building permit.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact HYDRO-2: Effects from Construction within a Floodplain PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Impact HYDRO-3: Water Quality Effects during Construction	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
Mitigation Measure HYDRO-3:	<p align="center">Construction Activity Storm Water Standards <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p>		
<p><i>Prior to the issuance of a City grading permit and the commencement of construction activities, the Applicant shall demonstrate to the City compliance with the SWRCB NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit), the City of Roseville’s Construction Standards, and the City’s Stormwater BMP Guidance Manual. The SWRCB requires that all construction sites have adequate control measures to reduce the discharge of sediment and other pollutants to streams to ensure compliance with Section 303 of the CWA. To comply with the NPDES permit, the Applicant shall file a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB and prepare a SWPPP prior to construction, which includes a detailed, site-specific listing of the potential sources of stormwater pollution; pollution prevention measures (erosion and sediment control measures and measures to control non-stormwater discharges and hazardous spills) to include a description of the type and location of erosion and sediment control BMPs to be implemented at the project site, and a BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule to determine the amount of pollutants leaving the project site. A copy of the SWPPP must be current and remain on the project site. Control measures are required prior to and throughout the rainy season. Water quality BMPs identified in the SWPPP could include but are not limited to the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, staked straw bales, and temporary revegetation) shall be employed for disturbed areas. No disturbed surfaces will be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.</i> <i>• Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.</i> <i>• A spill prevention and countermeasure plan shall be developed which would identify proper storage, collection, and disposal measures for potential pollutants (such as fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) used onsite. The plan would also require the proper storage, handling, use, and disposal of petroleum products.</i> <i>• Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize land disturbance during peak runoff periods and to the immediate area required for construction. Soil conservation practices shall be completed during the fall or late winter to reduce erosion during spring runoff. Existing vegetation will be retained where possible. To the extent feasible, grading activities shall be limited to the immediate area required for construction.</i> <i>• Surface water runoff shall be controlled by directing flowing water away from critical areas and by reducing runoff velocity. Diversion structures such as terraces, dikes, and ditches shall collect and direct runoff water around vulnerable areas to prepared drainage outlets. Surface roughening, berms, check dams, hay bales, or similar devices shall be used to reduce runoff velocity and erosion.</i> <i>• Sediment shall be contained when conditions are too extreme for treatment by surface protection. Temporary sediment traps, filter fabric fences, inlet protectors, vegetative filters and buffers, or settling basins shall be used to detain runoff water long enough for sediment particles to settle out. Store, cover, and isolate construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals, to prevent runoff losses and contamination of groundwater.</i> <i>• Topsoil removed during construction shall be carefully stored and treated as an important resource. Berms shall be placed around topsoil stockpiles to prevent runoff during storm events.</i> <i>• Establish fuel and vehicle maintenance areas away from all drainage courses and design these areas to control runoff.</i> <i>• Disturbed areas shall be revegetated after completion of construction activities.</i> 			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All necessary permits and approvals shall be obtained. Provide sanitary facilities for construction workers. <p>Timing: Before approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			
<p>Impact HYDRO-4: Water Quality Effects from Project Occupancy and Operation</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4: Storm Water Management Development Standards (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</p> <p><i>At the tentative map or site development stage, development shall be conditioned to include source control and LID strategies, treatment control measures, including but not limited to bio-retention treatment as required by the City’s then current design standards and the City’s then current General Phase II MS4 Permit issued by the State. The measures shall include, but are not limited to, the measures identified in the Amoruso Drainage Master Plan. In addition, necessary erosion and sediment control measures for University Creek at Discharge Point E and monitoring of University Creek downstream of the discharge point shall be incorporated into the project design plans and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to receiving building/grading permits.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact HYDRO-5: Effect on Groundwater Recharge</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure HYDRO-4</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Cumulative Impact HYDRO-1: Flooding, Water Quality, and Groundwater</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NS	NS	NS
Land Use and Planning			
<p>Impact LU-1: Result in Development of Incompatible Land Uses</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is feasible.</p>	S	S	S

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Impact LU-2: Physically Divide an Established Community PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact LU-3: Conflict with General Plan and Zoning Code PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact LU-4: Conflict with SACOG Blueprint and Sustainable Communities PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
<i>Noise</i>			
Impact NOISE-1: Construction Noise	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:	Construction Noise Control Measures <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i>		
<i>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce short-term construction-related noise impacts:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ensure construction activities comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance with respect to hours of operation.</i> • <i>Locate stationary construction equipment, such as compressors and generators, as far away as possible from sensitive receptors. Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust ports on power construction equipment.</i> • <i>Designate a disturbance coordinator to receive public complaints about construction noise disturbances, and determine the cause of the complaint, and implement any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem. Conspicuously post the coordinator’s phone number around the project site and in adjacent public spaces to encourage the public to report disturbances</i> • <i>Well Drilling Construction Noise:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>To the extent feasible, the on-site ASR well shall be drilled prior to the occupancy of residential units within 500 feet of the well site.</i> - <i>Noise curtains shall be utilized during drilling of the well if, at the time of well construction, homes are occupied within 1,000 feet of the well.</i> 			
Timing: During all phases of project construction.			
Enforcement: City of Roseville			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Impact NOISE-2: Noise from On-Site Activities	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
Mitigation Measure NOISE-2:	On-site Operations Noise Control Measures <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i>		
<p><i>For all commercial uses within 500 feet of residential uses, the developer shall implement the following or equally effective measures:</i></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where commercial uses adjoin common residential property lines, the following mitigation measures shall be included in the design of the commercial use:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>6-7 foot tall masonry walls shall be constructed to provide adequate isolation of noise generating activities.</i> - <i>HVAC equipment shall be located either at ground level, or when located on roof-tops, the building facades shall include parapets for shielding.</i> • <i>Where commercial uses adjoin common residential property lines, and loading docks or truck circulation routes face the residential areas, the following mitigation measures shall be included in the design of the commercial use:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Loading docks and truck delivery areas shall be a minimum distance of 376 feet from residential property lines;</i> - <i>Property line barriers shall be 8 feet in height. Circulation routes for trucks shall be located a minimum of 80 feet from residential property lines;</i> - <i>Loading dock and truck deliveries shall be limited to daytime hours;</i> - <i>All heating, cooling, and ventilation equipment shall be located within mechanical rooms where possible;</i> - <i>All heating, cooling, and ventilation equipment shall be shielded from view with solid barriers;</i> - <i>Emergency generators shall comply with the local noise criteria at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers; and</i> - <i>In cases where loading docks or truck delivery circulation routes are located less than 376 feet from residential property lines or if nighttime deliveries are required, an acoustical evaluation shall be submitted to the City to verify compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards. Uses that do not comply with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards shall not be permitted.</i> • <i>Prior to City approval of conditionally permitted uses; which include more substantial exterior noise sources such as car washes, automotive repair, and outdoor recreation, a noise study shall be prepared by an acoustical engineer that identifies the necessary measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. The City shall require that the measures identified in the noise study are implemented as a condition of approval of conditional use permits.</i> 			
<p>Timing: During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.</p>			
<p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>			

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact NOISE-3: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2035)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-3a: Traffic Noise Attenuation <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed analysis of interior noise levels shall be conducted when building plans are available for the residential uses adjacent to the planned Placer Parkway alignment. The analysis shall identify noise control measures that are required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard, such as installation of windows and doors with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 30 to 35, and these noise control measures shall be implemented to achieve compliance with the City’s standard. Such analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant recognized by the City of Roseville. Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses adjacent to Placer Parkway to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation. <p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-3b: Traffic Noise Control <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p>The following measures would reduce impacts to off-site sensitive receptors from traffic noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sunset Boulevard West shall be repaved from Pleasant Grove Road to Westbrook Boulevard using Open Graded Asphalt Concrete (OGAC). Pleasant Grove Road shall be repaved north of Baseline Road using OGAC. <p>Timing: During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
<p>Impact NOISE-4: Aviation Noise</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Cumulative Impact NOISE-1: Construction and Operational Noise Effects</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-3b.</p>	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
<i>Public Services</i>			
<p>Impact PUB-1: Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through 3</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Impact PUB-2: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Services PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact PUB-3: Increased Demand for School Facilities PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact PUB-4: Increased Demand for Library Services PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>			
Impact TRA-1: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections PA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is feasible.	S	S	S
Impact TRA-2: Consistency of Project with City of Roseville’s Policy of 70 Percent of Signalized Intersections Operating at LOS C or Better under Cumulative Conditions PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.	NE	NE	NE
Impact TRA-3: Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections Mitigation Measure TRA-3(a): Pay fair share of the improvements to the intersection of Cook Riolo Road/PFE Road (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) <i>The Applicant shall pay their fair share cost of any capacity enhancing improvements identified by Placer County at the Cook Riolo Road/PFE Road intersection.</i> Mitigation Measure TRA-3(b): Pay fair share of the improvements to the intersection of North Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue (Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) <i>The Applicant shall pay their fair share cost of installing a traffic signal at the North Foothills Boulevard/Athens Avenue intersection.</i> Timing: Before approval of the first subdivision map. Enforcement: City of Roseville	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact TRA-4: Increased Traffic on Highway Segments</p> <p>Mitigation Measure TRA-4: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to the affected SR 65 segments <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant shall pay the Highway 65 JPA Fee and the SPRTA Fee.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p>Enforcement: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); City of Roseville</p>	S(m)	S(m)	S(m)
<p>Impact TRA-5: Increased Demand for Local Transit Service</p> <p>Mitigation Measure TRA-5: Pay fair share of the cost toward local transit improvements <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant shall pay its fair share towards the capital improvements for expanded transit services to the project site. This includes bus turn-outs, shelter pads, and shelters.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact TRA-6: Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities</p> <p>PA, NA, A1 through A3</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>			
<p>Impact UTIL-1: Increased Demand on Water Supplies</p> <p>Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Secure Adequate Water Supply <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the approval of building permits, proponents of the Proposed Action (or an alternative) will provide their proportionate share of required funding through water connection development fee to the City for the acquisition and delivery of treated potable and recycled water supplies to the Proposed Action project site. Additionally, prior to the approval of building permits, the City shall enter into agreement with PCWA to acquire water supplies of sufficient quantity to serve the ARSP as described in the EIR and WSA. The identified source would need to be legally available and sufficient to meet the demand of the Proposed Action (or an alternative), consistent with the WFA and City policies and California Water Code Section 10910 et seq. and Government Code Section 66473.7 subject to a completed environmental review, approved by the agency with jurisdiction over the source, and funded.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
<p>Impact UTIL-2: Increased Demand on Water Treatment and Supply Facilities PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is feasible.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact UTIL-3: Increased Demand on Groundwater Supply PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact UTIL-4: Impacts from Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Facilities Mitigation Measure UTIL-4: WWTP Capacity <i>(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3)</i></p> <p><i>South Placer Wastewater Authority has approved expansion of the South Placer Wastewater Authority service area boundary to include the ARSP area. All Applicants shall participate financially in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows through payment of connection fees. The Applicant shall also participate on a fair share basis in other financial mechanisms for any additional environmental review required to secure approvals necessary to increase wastewater discharges from the plant, including approval by the South Placer Wastewater Authority for expansion of the service area boundary. It is recognized that the Applicant shall rely on the City (on behalf of the South Placer Wastewater Authority partners) to construct regional treatment and regional transmission facilities needed to treat and discharge wastewater produced within the service area boundary. In the event the City is unable to obtain all required permits (e.g. NPDES permit and WDRs) or is unable to complete the required facility expansion(s), development within the service area boundary may continue until existing capacity has been exhausted, at which time any remaining development shall be curtailed until such time as sufficient wastewater treatment and discharge capacity becomes available.</i></p> <p>Timing: Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any project phases.</p> <p>Enforcement: City of Roseville</p>	NE(m)	NE(m)	NE(m)
<p>Impact UTIL-5: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE
<p>Impact UTIL-6: Increased Demand for Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternatives 1 through 3 (A1 through 3)
Cumulative Impact UTIL-1: Effect on Water Supply PA, NA, A1 through 3 No mitigation is feasible.	S	S	S

Significant effects that cannot be reduced to less than significant are indicated in bold

NE: No effect

NE(m): No effect with mitigation

NS: Not Substantial

NS(m): Not Substantial with mitigation

S: Significant effect, no mitigation feasible

S(m): Significant effect after mitigation