

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the visual character of the Proposed Action site, the Alternative 4 site, and views from surrounding public areas to these two sites. This section also evaluates the change to visual resources in the area, including change in visual character, view obstruction, and night lighting, as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Sources of information used in this analysis include:

- California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program (CSHP 2010); and
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville (City of Roseville 2010).

3.1.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1.2.1 Regional Setting

Placer County is located in the Sacramento Valley and Sierra Nevada regions of Northern California. The project site is located in western Placer County, immediately adjacent to the west side of the City of Roseville. The west side of the City is a transitional zone between the flat, open terrain of the Sacramento Valley to the west and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east.

Development predominates the visual setting of the City, and is evident throughout western Placer County. In some areas of the region, development has completely eliminated the historically rural character associated with regional ranching and agricultural operations. In other areas of western Placer County, development has segmented or isolated open space areas, thereby heightening the aesthetic value of remaining contiguous open space (City of Roseville 2010). Areas that are not developed are dominated by non-native grasslands. This open range land is dry most of the year (from June to early spring) resulting in earth tone colors. Vernal pools appear throughout the non-native grasslands during the early spring until June. Flower production associated with the vernal pools provides some color contrasts on a seasonal basis (City of Roseville 2010).

Long-range views of the Sierra Nevada, Sutter Buttes, and the Coast Range are available throughout Western Placer County. No prominent natural features are located in the vicinity of the project site. Prominent manmade features in the vicinity of the project site include the Roseville Energy Park (REP) and the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP) located north of the City, and the Western Area Power Authority (WAPA) corridor located within the project site (City of Roseville 2010).

No state designated scenic highways or locally designated scenic corridors are located within the vicinity of the project site (CSHP 2010).

3.1.2.2 Project Site - Existing Conditions

The project site is characterized by gently rolling topography and large, open annual grassland areas. The site's natural features include Curry Creek, which flows in a westerly direction and traverses the

southeastern and the southwestern portions of the site; a small seasonal swale (locally called Federico Creek), which flows through the northern portion of the site and joins Curry Creek near Watt Road; and an unnamed tributary to Curry Creek that also flows west across the northern portion of the project site, but does not join Curry Creek within the site. Seasonal wetlands, including vernal pools, are scattered throughout the site. Approximately 90 trees are present on the site with the majority of these occurring in a eucalyptus stand in the western portion of the project site and along Curry Creek.

Features of the human environment present on the site include four large-lot single family residences; small structures associated with ongoing dry farming agricultural activities (grazing); dirt roads and fencing; two areas along Baseline Road where strawberry fields and a fruit stand are present; and transmission lines. A 375-foot-wide easement that contains multiple transmission lines extends in an east-west direction through the northern portion of the site. The easement is owned by the WAPA and Sacramento Municipal Utility District. In addition, there is a 50-foot-wide electrical easement that extends in a north-south direction through a portion of the site.

Lands to the north and east of the project site are located in the City of Roseville, and are presently developed with urban uses. Unincorporated areas in Placer County are located to the west and south of the project site. These areas currently include undeveloped dry pasture land and rural residential uses with topography similar to that of the project site.

Views of the project site are available from the roadways that border the site, which are Fiddymment Road to the east and Baseline Road to the south. Views of the project site are also visible from the southern boundary of the West Roseville Specific Plan and the western boundary of the North Roseville Specific Plan. Views from these areas consist primarily of grasslands, the WAPA corridor, and the strawberry fields on Baseline Road (City of Roseville 2010).

Views from the Sierra Vista project site to the north consist of construction activities and developed residential uses associated with the West Roseville Specific Plan. Views from the project site to the east include Fiddymment Road and residential development in the North Roseville Specific Plan area. On clear days, long distance views of the Sierra Foothills and the Sierra Mountain Range are also available to the east. Views to the south consist of Baseline Road and rural residential and open space associated with the proposed Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. No buildings over two stories are located within the immediate vicinity. The views to the west are open, and include generally flat grasslands and a continuation of the WAPA corridor (City of Roseville 2010). **Figures 3.1-1 through 3.1-5** illustrate views throughout the project site.

Sources of light and glare on the project site include existing residential and farm-related structures along Baseline Road. However, the majority of the project site is undeveloped with no source of light and glare. Limited sources of light and glare occur immediately adjacent to the project site. Residences that are to east of Fiddymment Road and within the North Roseville Specific Plan area produce minimal light at night. Vehicles using the roadways near the site produce some glare during the day. The greatest existing source of nighttime lighting in the project vicinity is the urban development within the City of Roseville.



SOURCE: City of Roseville, November 2009

FIGURE **3.1-1**

View Toward the Conley Residence



SOURCE: City of Roseville, November 2009

FIGURE 3.1-2

View of WAPA Corridor Toward East



SOURCE: City of Roseville, November 2009

FIGURE **3.1-3**

View of Stock Pond in Central Portion of Project Site



SOURCE: City of Roseville, November 2009

FIGURE **3.1-4**

Curry Creek Drainage Channel: View South Toward Baseline Road



SOURCE: Jeff Glazner 2008

FIGURE **3.1-5**

Aerial View West From Fiddymment Road in the Foreground of the Proposed Action

3.1.2.3 Alternative 4 Site – Existing Conditions

Alternative 4 site is located approximately 2 miles west of the project site. The site has flat to rolling topography and land cover comprising of rice fields, annual grassland, pasture, and some dispersed rural residences. Views of the site are available from roadways near the site, including Baseline Road to the south, Country Acres Lane to the east, and Locust Road to the west. Views from these locations consist primarily of rice fields, annual grassland, and rural residences. Sources of light and glare at the Alternative 4 site are very limited since the site and the surrounding areas are largely undeveloped. Similar to the project site, sources of glare include vehicles using roadways near the site and the greatest existing source of nighttime lighting is the urban development in the City of Roseville and suburban development in unincorporated Placer County south of Baseline Road.

3.1.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK – APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

3.1.3.1 City of Roseville General Plan Community Design Goals and Policies

- Goal 1:** Achieve a consistent level of high quality aesthetic and functional design through the development of, and adherence to, superior design concepts and principles as defined in the Communitywide Design Guidelines.
- Goal 3:** Encourage the planning and building of a city which sensitively integrates open space and natural resources, and promotes compatibility within and between natural and the urban environment.
- Policy 1:** Through the design review process, apply design standards that promote the use of high quality building materials, architectural and site designs, landscaping signage, and amenities.
- Policy 2:** Continue to development and apply design standards that result in efficient site and building design standards that result in efficient site and building designs, pedestrian friendly projects that stimulate the use of alternative modes of transportation and the establishment of a functional relationship between adjacent developments.
- Policy 3:** Encourage designs that strike a balance between the incorporation of aesthetic and development requirements, and the economic considerations associated with development.
- Policy 4:** Promote flexibility in the design review process to achieve design objectives, and encourage projects with innovative, unique, and creative architectural style and design.
- Policy 5:** Encourage, promote, and support art in public spaces and programs to enhance the design of the City.
- Policy 6:** Through the design review process, encourage site and building designs that are in scale and compatible with adjacent development with respect to height, bulk, form, mass, and community character.

- Policy 7:** Encourage project designs that place a high priority and value on open space, and the preservation, enhancement and incorporation of natural resources and other features including consideration of topography, vegetation, wetlands, and water courses.
- Policy 8:** Encourage and promote the preservation of historic and/or unique culturally and architecturally significant buildings, features, and visual environments.
- Policy 9:** The location and preservation of native oak trees and oak woodlands shall be a primary factor in determining site design, building location, grading, construction, and landscaping and in establishing the character of projects through their use as a unifying element in both new and existing development.

3.1.3.2 City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines

The City's Community Design Guidelines, which specify site layout and design, architectural treatments, specific exterior materials, and lighting guidelines, ensure that design is taken into consideration at the time development is proposed.

Design Goals

- Foster project designs that create and enhance a sense of identity and place.
- To promote site designs that preserve, enhance, and incorporate the natural features of a site as an element within the overall design.
- Ensure project designs that are attractive and safe for customers, yield a variety of retail and business opportunities, and contribute to creating active gathering places for the community.
- Create projects of superior architectural and visual interest, while recognizing the need for balance between form, function, and economic limitations.
- Incorporate environmentally sustainable features into project design.
- Consider and respond to the relationship and context of adjacent projects.
- Natural topography should be integrated into site design to the extent feasible.

3.1.3.3 Sierra Vista Specific Plan Design Guidelines

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan contains design guidelines that supplement the City's Community Design Guidelines, and are intended to provide design guidance for the physical form and visual character of the Proposed Action. These guidelines address landscape architecture, entry features and signage, walls and fencing, street lighting, paseos, and special design consideration for the village node district, residential areas, commercial areas, parks, and fire stations.

3.1.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.1.4.1 Significance Thresholds

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance requires an evaluation of a proposed action's effect on the human environment. The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has determined that the Proposed

Action or its alternatives would result in significant effects related to aesthetics if the Proposed Action or an alternative would:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource;
- substantially degrade the visual character of the site and its surroundings; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

3.1.4.2 Analysis Methodology

The USACE evaluated project conditions against the existing visual character of the project site and off-site alternative locations in the context of topography, vegetation, existing uses, and visual character. The USACE evaluated the potential impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings in terms of massing, size, or scale of development, and type of land use. The USACE also evaluated the potential for each alternative to introduce substantial new lighting and/or create new sources of glare that could affect nearby existing uses in order to determine potential impacts to visual resources.

3.1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact AES-1 Effect on Scenic Vistas

Proposed Action With the implementation of the Proposed Action, views of open rangeland, the foothills, and Sierra Nevada would no longer be available from Baseline and Fiddymont Roads. As these views may be considered valuable by some, this change in the human environment would be a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

A scenic vista is generally defined as an expansive view of a highly valued landscape as observable from a publicly accessible vantage point. Key publicly accessible areas in the project vicinity include Fiddymont and Baseline Roads. Other lands in the project vicinity are privately owned and not publicly accessible. Descriptions of the scenic vistas as available from these two roadways are presented below and changes in the views from these roadways as a result of the Proposed Action are evaluated.

For viewers traveling northbound, Fiddymont Road provides expansive views of the project site and beyond. These views comprise vast, open rangeland, punctuated by trees and the WAPA corridor. For viewers traveling eastbound, Baseline Road provides views of the project site that comprise rolling grasslands traversed by Curry Creek and the WAPA corridor in the fore and middle ground, and the foothills and Sierra Nevada range in the distant background.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in the large-scale development of the project site that would interrupt these views by placing buildings within these view corridors. The Sierra Vista Specific Plan calls for an open space corridor along Curry Creek

and underneath the WAPA corridor, which would preserve these corridors as short-range viewsheds. Long-range views of the Sierra Nevada foothills and the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range to the east would also be available from this open space area. However, the Proposed Action would modify the existing views from Fiddymment Road looking west and the views from Baseline Road looking towards the east. The Proposed Action would develop the open space on the project site that makes the scenic vista expansive. Structures on the project site, near the two roadways, would interrupt the long-range views. Therefore, scenic vistas would no longer be available. Furthermore, while views would be available along the open space corridors, these views would no longer appear expansive.

Development under the Proposed Action would be required to comply with the City's Design Guidelines, General Plan policies, and Sierra Vista Design Guidelines, all of which are intended to reduce aesthetic effects. However, views of open rangeland and the foothills and Sierra Nevada would no longer be available from Baseline and Fiddymment Roads, which would be a **significant** effect. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would construct a smaller mixed-use development on the project site. The scenic vistas from Baseline Road and Fiddymment Road would no longer be available because there would be practically continuous development adjacent to both roads under this alternative. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on scenic vistas would be **significant** under the No Action Alternative. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

Alts. 1, 2, 3 (On Site) All of the on-site alternatives would construct a mixed use development on the project site. All three alternatives include substantially more open space areas adjacent to Baseline Road but only slightly more open space adjacent to Fiddymment Road. Therefore, the effect on scenic vistas as viewed from Fiddymment Road would be substantially the same as described above for the Proposed Action but the effect on vistas as viewed from Baseline Road would be much reduced compared to the Proposed Action. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on scenic vistas would be **significant** under all of the on-site alternatives. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site. Baseline Road, Country Acres Lane, and Locust Road are publicly accessible locations from where expansive views that include the Alternative 4 site are available. Alternative 4 would affect views from Baseline Road by locating structures adjacent to the roadway and replacing open rangelands and rice fields with urban development. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on scenic vistas would be **significant** under the off-site alternative. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

Concerning off-site infrastructure, off-site roadway widening and construction of several off-site utility lines will be required for Alternative 4. Most of the infrastructure would be placed underground, and any infrastructure that is above ground would not be of substantial height to interrupt views of surrounding scenic vistas. Therefore, the effect from the construction of off-site infrastructure under Alternative 4 would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Impact AES-2 Effect on Scenic Resources

- Proposed Action** The effect of the Proposed Action on scenic resources would be **less than significant**. No mitigation is required. The project site does not contain any scenic natural resources, such as rock outcroppings and/or distinctive trees. In addition, the project site is not located within the view corridor of a scenic highway.
- No Action Alt.** The No Action Alternative would construct a reduced mixed-use development on the project site. The effect of the No Action Alternative on scenic resources would be **less than significant** based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action. No mitigation is required.
- Alts. 1, 2, 3 (On Site)** The effect of all of the on-site alternatives on scenic resources would be **less than significant** based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action. No mitigation is required.
- Alt. 4 (Off Site)** The Alternative 4 site does not contain any scenic natural resources such as rock outcroppings or distinctive trees, nor is the site within the view corridor of a scenic highway. The same is true for the alignment and sites of off-site infrastructure associated with this alternative. The effect of the off-site alternative on scenic resources would be **less than significant** based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action. No mitigation is required.

Impact AES-3 Degradation of Visual Character

- Proposed Action** The conversion of undeveloped rangeland to urban development would represent a **significant** degradation of the visual character of the project site. No feasible mitigation measures are available to fully address this effect.
- The project site is primarily undeveloped open rangeland. Development of the project site would convert about 1,370 acres (554 hectares) of undeveloped land to urban uses and conserve 257 acres (104 hectares) as open space. The introduction of residences, commercial uses, and infrastructure in an area that is presently undeveloped would change the existing visual character of the project site. The areas to the east and northeast of the site have been developed with residential uses. Development of the Proposed Action would extend this urban edge. Although the Proposed Action would be visually compatible with surrounding developed and approved development to the north, it would substantially and permanently alter the existing visual character of the project site by introducing an extensive roadway

network, homes, offices, commercial, and other urban facilities into an undeveloped area. This represents a **significant** effect. The City of Roseville General Plan Policies for Community Design serve to promote the visual compatibility of developments through the application of community design standards. Specifically, Policy 6 requires site and building designs that are in scale and compatible with adjacent development. In addition, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) Design Guidelines include specific screening requirements for utilities and mechanical units. Implementation of the General Plan policies and the SVSP Design Guidelines would help reduce the severity of effects associated with new development. However, no feasible mitigation measures are available to fully address this effect.

No Action The effect of the No Action Alternative on visual character would be less substantial than the Proposed Action, but the effect would still be adverse. The No Action Alternative would develop 1,135 acres (459 hectares) on the project site with urban uses and preserve 492 acres (199 hectares) as open space. Although this alternative would preserve large areas of open space in the southeastern and western portion of the site, the change in the site's visual character would be considered significant. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on visual character would be **significant** under the No Action Alternative. No feasible mitigation measures are available to address this effect.

Alts. 1, 2, 3 (On Site) All of the on-site alternatives would substantially change the visual character of the site. The on-site alternatives would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action. All three alternatives would preserve more acreage (477 and 599 acres [193 and 242 hectares]) as open space than the Proposed Action (257 acres [104 hectares]). However, despite this difference, the alternatives would substantially build out the project site and change its character substantially. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on visual character would be **significant** under all the on-site alternatives. No feasible mitigation measures are available to address this effect.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) Alternative 4 would substantially change the visual character of its site. Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site. Development at the Alternative 4 site would substantially alter the visual character of the site and its surroundings by facilitating the change of rural agricultural lands to urbanized development. The Alternative 4 site is surrounded on all sides by rural agricultural lands and is removed from any existing urban development. As the Alternative 4 site is not close to any existing urban development, the effect on visual character would be greater than under the Proposed Action. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on visual character would be **significant** under the off-site alternative. No feasible mitigation measures are available to address this effect.

Concerning off-site infrastructure, as stated above, off-site roadway widening and construction of several off-site utility lines will be required for Alternative 4. Because utilities would be placed underground, visual impacts will be related to the period of construction and revegetation. The potential exceptions would be pump stations and similar facilities where some portion of the facility may remain above ground. However such facilities would be small in their scale and unlikely to significantly affect the visual character of the area. Roadway widening will occur adjacent to existing roadways and will not introduce a new visual element. As visual impacts during construction would be temporary in nature, they are considered minor and **less than significant**.

Impact AES-4 Effects from New Sources of Light and Glare

Proposed Action The Proposed Action would result in **significant** effects from new sources of light and glare. Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects, but not to less than significant. A residual **significant** effect would remain after mitigation.

The project site is primarily undeveloped open rangeland. There is currently little night lighting from the four existing residences and farm-related structures on the project site. The Proposed Action would result in the development of the project site with a wide variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and business uses. Night lighting would be required in residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, and recreational facilities, parking lots, and along streets for safety and recreational use. Therefore, development associated with the Proposed Action would introduce a substantial amount of nightlight in the area. Additionally, daytime glare would result from light reflecting off pavement, vehicles, and buildings. The addition of this light and glare would alter the rural landscape and nighttime views of the project site and its vicinity, and possibly inhibit views of the nighttime sky. This is considered a **significant** effect.

Mitigation Measures AES-4a through **AES-4d** are proposed to address the effects related to light and glare. These measures are the same as Mitigation Measures 4.14-1(a) and (b), Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, and Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR and were adopted by the City of Roseville at the time of project approval and will be enforced by the City. However, because the project site, which currently lacks light and glare sources, would still be visibly changed in the context of nighttime lighting and daytime glare, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR determined that these mitigation measures would not reduce the effect to less than significant (City of Roseville 2010). The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR and finds that a residual **significant** effect would remain after mitigation.

No Action The No Action Alternative would construct a smaller mixed use development on the project site. While the effects would be reduced compared to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would nonetheless result in **significant** effects related to light and glare based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the

Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measures AES-4a through **AES-4d** are proposed to address this effect. As noted above, these measures are the same as Mitigation Measures 4.14-1(a) and (b), Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, and Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR. The USACE assumes that the City of Roseville would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. However, because the project site, which currently lacks light and glare sources, would still be visibly changed in the context of nighttime lighting and daytime glare, these mitigation measures would not reduce the effect to less than significant. The USACE finds that a residual **significant** effect would remain after mitigation.

**Alts. 1, 2, 3
(On Site)**

All of the on-site alternatives would construct a project broadly similar to Proposed Action. The effect related to light and glare would be slightly reduced but still **significant** based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measures AES-4a through **AES-4d** are proposed to address this effect. As noted above, these measures are the same as Mitigation Measures 4.14-1(a) and (b), Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, and Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR. The USACE assumes that the City of Roseville would impose the same mitigation measures on the on-site alternatives to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, these mitigation measures would not reduce the effect to less than significant. The USACE finds that a residual **significant** effect would remain after mitigation.

**Alt. 4
(Off Site)**

Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site. The effect related to light and glare would be considered greater because Alternative 4 site is at a distance from existing urban development and the development of the mixed use community at this site would create a substantial new nighttime light source surrounded on all sides by areas that are essentially not illuminated. The same would be true for above-ground facilities associated with off-site infrastructure. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect would be **significant**.

Mitigation Measures AES-4a through **AES-4d** are proposed to address this effect. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose mitigation measures similar to these mitigation measures on the off-site alternative and would find that the measures would not reduce the effect to less than significant. Accordingly, the USACE also finds that a residual **significant** effect would remain after mitigation. The USACE acknowledges that it has no authority to require **Mitigation Measures AES-4a** through **AES-4d** and cannot guarantee that the County will impose these measures.

Mitigation Measure AES-4a**Site Lighting to Minimize Nuisance****(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)**

Light-producing uses, such as ball fields, within the SVSP Area shall be located and oriented to minimize visual impacts on adjacent residential areas. Lighting shall be shielded and designed to distribute light in the most effective and efficient manner, using the minimum amount of light to achieve the necessary illumination for the use, as defined by suggested lighting standards for competitive play.

Mitigation Measure AES-4b**Disclosure Requirements****(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)**

The developers shall be required to disclose to all adjacent residential areas (as shown as KT-1 and KT-40 on the Land Use Plan), through a deed disclosure or other similar notice approved by the City Attorney, that a Citywide park is proposed that will contain outdoor lighting and noise from recreation activities.

Mitigation Measure AES-4c**Use of Low Glare Materials for New Development****(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)**

In order to reduce the effects of daytime glare from development of commercial or office uses within the SVSP Area, building developers should make use, when feasible, of low-glare materials.

Mitigation Measure AES-4d**Avoid Light Spill Over into Curry Creek and Open Space Areas****(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)**

Outdoor lighting shall be placed, designed, and directed so as to avoid light spillover into the habitat of Curry Creek and the Open Space Preserve areas located immediately adjacent to the open space, as shown on the Land Use Map as parcels KT-1, KT-40, KT-30, KT-41, DF-1, DF-2, DF-40, CG-1, CG-82, JM-21, JM-3, and JM-4.

3.1.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Impacts AES-1 and AES-3 would remain **significant** under the Proposed Action and all alternatives as no feasible mitigation measures are available. A residual significant effect would remain under the Proposed Action and all alternatives for **Impact AES-4** after mitigation. All of the other effects would be **less than significant**.

3.1.7 REFERENCES

California Department of Transportation. 2010. "California Scenic Highway Program."
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm.

City of Roseville. 2010. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*.