

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) has been prepared to respond to comments received on the Draft EIS for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project. The Final EIS has been prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The USACE is the lead agency under NEPA.

On July 6, 2012, the USACE released the Draft EIS for public review and comment. The comment period closed on August 20, 2012. The Draft EIS evaluated the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action and five alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, three on-site alternative development plans, and the Southwest Site Alternative. Written comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, as well as from organizations and individuals. The USACE considered the comments received on the Draft EIS.

The Final EIS consists of the entire Draft EIS, and the comments, responses to comments, and revisions to the Draft EIS.

## 1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE FINAL EIS

NEPA requires a lead agency that has completed a Draft EIS to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies (cooperating, responsible, and/or trustee agencies) that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the proposed action, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS is a mechanism for responding to these comments. This Final EIS has been prepared to respond to comments received from agencies, organizations, and members of the public on the Draft EIS for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project, which are reproduced in this document; and to present corrections, revisions, and other clarifications and amplifications to the Draft EIS made in response to these comments.

As described in the Draft EIS, development on the project site would require the filling of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States as defined by the Clean Water Act (CWA). This discharge of fill material requires approval from the USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the federal CWA, under which the USACE issues or denies DA permits for activities involving a discharge of dredged or fill materials into the waters of the United States, including wetlands. The Applicants have submitted a total of 11 Section 404 permit applications in support of the SVSP Project. Ten applications cover development on the 10 properties that make up the SVSP site and one application covers the construction of the proposed infrastructure needed to support the development of the proposed mixed-use community. If the USACE approves the 10 individual permits and a Regional General Permit for the infrastructure improvements, the Applicants would be allowed to fill approximately 24.81 acres (10.04 hectares) of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States, and development of urban uses in the area would be a reasonably foreseeable outcome of the approvals. A Draft RGP is included in Appendix A. The Draft EIS and this Final EIS will be used to support the USACE's decision whether to issue permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and issue a record of decision (ROD).

## 1.2 PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would implement the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP), which is a proposed specific plan project that includes development of a 1,612-acre (652-hectare) site with a mix of land uses, predominantly residential use with commercial and office uses; public and quasi-public uses; parks and open space; and the infrastructure improvements to support these uses. The project site is located northwest of the intersection of Fiddymont Road and Baseline Road in the western portion of the City of Roseville. The project site is made up of 10 properties<sup>1</sup> controlled by the following six entities: CGB Investments; D.F. Properties, Inc.; Mourier Investment, LLC (MILLC); Baseline P&R, LLC; Baybrook LP.; and Westpark Associates.

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 known as Federico Creek), which flows through the northern portion of the site and joins Curry Creek near Watt Avenue; and an unnamed tributary to Curry Creek that also flows west across the northern portion of the project 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 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 (144-meter-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 Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) and Sacramento Municipal Utility District. In addition, there is a 50-foot-wide (15-meter-wide) electrical easement that extends in a north-south direction through a portion of the site.

## 1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 2004, the City annexed the West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) Area immediately north of the project site. At that time the boundary of the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) was adjusted to align with that of the 5,500-acre (2,226-hectare) "Transition Area" between the City and Placer County. The Transition Area identified an area that was likely to develop in the future given its proximity to existing services and infrastructure, which had been defined in 1997 to foster cooperative land use planning under the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and County. The majority of the SVSP site is located within this MOU area.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time that the Draft EIS was published, the project site comprised nine properties controlled by six entities. Since then, one of the properties has been subdivided into two properties with Mourier Investment, LLC (MILLC) owning the southern half of the property and Westpark Associates owning the northern half of the property. Therefore the project site now comprises 10 properties controlled by the same six entities listed above.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG's) Preferred Blueprint Scenario, adopted in December 2004 to promote compact mixed-use development and increased use of transit as an alternative to low-density "sprawl," also identified the project site as appropriate to accommodate growth. In this context, the City envisions the SVSP, as completing the unfinished comprehensive planning process for the project site, in order to "implement a large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density master planned community in the City consistent with the City's General Plan and Growth Management Guiding Principles related to new development west of Roseville and the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies."<sup>2</sup>

In May 2010, the City of Roseville and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project and approved the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. The EIR was also the basis for Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to approve the annexation of the entire SVSP site in January 2012. The entire SVSP site is now within the Roseville City limits.

#### 1.4 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

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

The Proposed Action is defined in the statement of project purpose as a large-scale community in western Placer County. Western Placer County is generally defined as the portion of Placer County west of Interstate 80 (I-80) and Highway 65.

For purposes of this EIS, the Proposed Action is defined as a "large scale" master-planned community project because it would develop approximately 1,612 acres (652 hectares) of land. Based on a review of the history of land development proposals in Placer County between 1990 and 2011, a large-scale development project is typically one comprising at least 1,000 acres (405 hectares) of land development.

The Proposed Action is defined as a "mixed-use" community as it comprises not only residential but also commercial uses, public and quasi-public uses, parks, and open space. The residential component of the project is proposed to help meet the foreseeable regional housing demand based on Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) projections that the region will add approximately 2 million people by 2050.<sup>3</sup>

The Proposed Action is defined as a "mixed-density" community because a range of housing types and residential densities are proposed in order to serve the diverse housing needs of the region.

Commercial uses are an element of the mixed-use community. The commercial component is proposed because the commercial land uses would ensure that the local jurisdiction will collect sufficient tax revenue from the proposed community to provide necessary public services. A large-scale residential-only development would not be fiscally sustainable because the tax revenue from property taxes alone

<sup>2</sup> City of Roseville. 2010. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan*. Adopted May 5.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy 2035 adopted by SACOG in April 2012, the region is now projected to grow to 871,000 persons by 2035.

would be insufficient to provide the needed City or County services. The types of commercial uses included in the Proposed Action range from neighborhood commercial uses such as grocery stores to community commercial uses, including “power centers.”<sup>4</sup> Under the Proposed Action, up to two power centers would be developed, in addition to neighborhood-serving retail (grocery stores, drug stores, etc.) and business professional commercial uses. In order for the proposed mixed-use community to be fiscally sustainable, conservatively it is assumed for this EIS that at least one power center needs to be included in the development plan.

The mix of land uses and the densities and intensities of the SVSP are also consistent with SACOG’s “Preferred Blueprint Scenario,” which advocates densities and intensities higher than those traditionally seen in the Sacramento Region as a means of reducing the severity of long-term environmental impacts. By making a more efficient use of land and facilitating pedestrian travel, bicycle use, and transit use, the combination of mixed uses and more compact development patterns would likely reduce per capita resource consumption (e.g., land, water, electricity, vehicle fuel, energy) and per capita pollution generation (e.g., traditional air pollutants and greenhouse gases).

## 1.5 AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The USACE is serving as the lead agency for NEPA compliance.

The following agencies and entities also have discretionary authority or legal jurisdiction over part or all of the Proposed Action, or special expertise relevant to the Proposed Action.

- US Environmental Protection Agency
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife<sup>5</sup>
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- City of Roseville

On May 27, 2008, the USACE requested the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) cooperate in the preparation of the EIS because of their expertise with regard to aquatic resources and Endangered species, respectively. The USEPA declined the role of cooperating agency on June 19, 2008. The USACE reiterated its request for cooperating agencies to both USEPA and USFWS on October 5, 2009, and USEPA again declined on March 18, 2010. The USFWS did not respond to the USACE request. Although the agencies did not cooperate formally under NEPA, both the USEPA and USFWS provided input during preparation of the Draft EIS.

---

<sup>4</sup> A power center is defined as a commercial/shopping center dominated by several large anchors, including discount department stores, off-price stores, warehouse clubs, or “category killers,” i.e., stores that offer tremendous selection in a particular merchandise category at low prices (ICSC 1999). A power center typically occupies at least 50 acres although some centers can be twice that size.

<sup>5</sup> As of January 1, 2013, the California Department of Fish and Game was renamed the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

When making decisions on the Proposed Action, state agencies including the California Department of Transportation, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), and the City of Roseville can also rely on the EIR certified by the Roseville City Council in May 2010 rather than on this EIS.

## **1.6 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

As discussed earlier in the chapter, based on their ability to meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action and their feasibility as determined by the application of screening criteria, three on-site alternatives and one off-site alternative were determined to be reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action and were carried forward in the Draft EIS for detailed evaluation along with the No Action Alternative. These alternatives are briefly described below.

### **1.6.1 Alternative 1: Reduced Footprint/Increased Density Alternative**

This on-site alternative would develop the 1,612-acre (652-hectare) project site, but would reduce the footprint of development within the site by increasing the acreage designated as open space, with the additional open space focused in areas that contain the greatest concentrations of sensitive habitat (vernal pools and/or drainages). Under this alternative, total acreage to be developed would be reduced to 1,027 acres (416 hectares), compared to 1,370 acres (554 hectares) under the Proposed Action, and open space would increase to 599 acres (242 hectares), compared to 234 acres (95 hectares) under the Proposed Action. The residential development footprint would decrease to 593 acres (240 hectares), versus 820 acres (332 hectares) under the Proposed Action. However, residential densities would increase to accommodate a similar number of residential units (6,655 dwelling units under this alternative, compared to 6,650 dwelling units under the Proposed Action). Acreage designated for commercial uses would be reduced slightly under this alternative. In addition, although the extent of designated open space would increase, the Citywide park included in the Proposed Action would be eliminated. On- and off-site utility infrastructure required to serve development under Alternative 1 would be similar to infrastructure required to serve development under the Proposed Action.

### **1.6.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint/Same Density Alternative**

The Reduced Footprint/Same Density Alternative is also an on-site alternative that would have the same reduced development footprint as Alternative 1 described above, but would develop the site at the same density as the Proposed Action. As a result, this alternative would provide 4,931 dwelling units, compared to 6,650 dwelling units under the Proposed Action. Acreage designated for commercial uses would be reduced slightly under this alternative in comparison with the Proposed Action. In addition, although the extent of designated open space would increase, the Citywide park included in the Proposed Action would be eliminated. On- and off-site utility infrastructure and roadway improvements required to serve development under Alternative 2 would be similar to infrastructure required to serve development under the Proposed Action.

### 1.6.3 Alternative 3: Focused Avoidance Alternative

Under the Focused Avoidance Alternative, in addition to the areas preserved as open space under the Proposed Action, an additional 248 acres (100 hectares) located primarily in the central and western portions of the site would be preserved. This would reduce the development footprint to 1,150 acres (465 hectares), compared to 1,370 acres (554 hectares) under the Proposed Action. Residential density would not be increased; therefore, total residential development would be reduced to 5,346 dwelling units, compared to 6,650 dwelling units under the Proposed Action. Commercial uses would be reduced by 77 acres (31 hectares) as compared to the Proposed Action. Public/quasi-public uses would largely be the same as under the Proposed Action. On- and off-site utility infrastructure and roadway improvements required to serve development under Alternative 3 would be similar to infrastructure required to serve development under the Proposed Action.

### 1.6.4 Alternative 4: Southwest Site

This alternative is off-site and would construct the proposed mixed-use community on an approximately 2,389-acre (967-hectare) site located on Baseline Road approximately 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) to the west of the project site. The Southwest site is bounded by the extension of Sankey Road and the County-approved Regional University and Community SP Area to the north, the Sutter County line to the west, the Country Acres rural residential area and Baseline Road to the south, and the Curry Creek Community Plan (CP) area to the east. This site has not previously been proposed for development. Under this alternative, the site would be developed with about 875 acres (354 hectares) of residential uses (5,595 dwelling units at buildout), 138 acres (54 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 75 acres (30 hectares) of public and quasi-public uses, 90 acres (36 hectares) of parks, and 22 acres (9 hectares) of paseos. About 953 acres (386 hectares) would be preserved as open space.

Off-site utility improvements required to served development under Alternative 4 include water, sewer, and recycled water pipelines. A sewer force main would be constructed from a sewer pump station on the alternative site in a northerly and then easterly direction to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). Finally, a recycled water line would be constructed from the Pleasant Grove WWTP to the alternative site along the same alignment as the sewer main. To serve the early phases of development on the Alternative 4 site, a water main connecting to the City of Roseville water distribution system would be constructed from the intersection of Fiddymont Road and Baseline Road west along Baseline Road to the alternative site, then north along Brewer Road through the site, and then in an easterly direction to a location 0.5 mile northwest of the Pleasant Grove WWTP. To serve the buildout, additional water would be supplied to the site from the Ophir water treatment plant that has been approved for construction by Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). Water from this plant would be conveyed to the vicinity of Alternative 4 site via a new pipeline that would extend from the Ophir plant through the City of Rocklin and north of the City of Roseville where it would then turn south down Watt Avenue along the western boundary of Roseville to Baseline Road. The pipeline would be constructed by the PCWA.

### 1.6.5 Alternative 5: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative the project site would be developed in a manner that avoids activities in jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, and thereby avoids the need for USACE approvals under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, local approvals from the City and state agencies would still be required. The No Action Alternative may also require authorization from the USFWS under the federal Endangered Species Act because of the potential for take of federally listed species.

The No Action Alternative would involve development of portions of the approximately 1,612-acre (652-hectare) SVSP site, resulting in a reduced extent of residential and commercial uses. Avoidance of Section 404 triggers would reduce the total development footprint to 771 acres (312 hectares), comprising 489 acres (198 hectares) of residential uses (3,729 dwelling units at buildout), 147 acres (59 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 58 acres (23 hectares) of public and quasi-public uses, 68 acres (28 hectares) of parks, and 9 acres (4 hectares) of paseos. About 755 acres (306 hectares) would be preserved as open space. On- and off-site utility infrastructure required to serve development under the No Action Alternative would be similar to infrastructure required to serve development under the Proposed Action.

The analysis of the No Action Alternative assumes that while the project site would develop in the manner described above, the project region would develop consistent with the local general plans.

## 1.7 NEPA REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS

NEPA requires the Final EIS to include and respond to all substantive comments received on the Draft EIS (40 CFR Section 1503.4). Lead agency responses may include the need to:

- modify the proposed action or alternatives
- develop and evaluate new alternatives
- supplement, improve, or modify the substantive environmental analyses
- make factual corrections to the text, tables, or figures contained in the Draft EIS
- explain why no further response is necessary

Additionally, the Final EIS must discuss any responsible opposing view that was not adequately discussed in the Draft EIS and must indicate the lead agency's response to the issue raised.

## 1.8 REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCUMENT CERTIFICATION AND FUTURE STEPS IN PROJECT APPROVAL

The Final EIS is being distributed to agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will be available for public review for 30 days after a notice is published in the Federal Register. Comments shall be sent to:

US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
 Regulatory Division  
 Attn: Kathy Norton  
 1325 J Street, Room 1480  
 Sacramento, California 95814-2922  
 Fax: (916) 557-6877

Email: DLL-CESPK-RD-EIS-Comments@usace.army.mil

USACE will circulate the Final EIS for a minimum of 30 days before taking action on the permit applications and issuing its ROD. The ROD will address the decision, alternatives considered, the environmentally superior alternative, relevant factors considered in the decision, and mitigation and monitoring.

## 1.9 ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF THE FINAL EIS

This Final EIS has been organized in the following manner:

- **Chapter 1.0, Introduction** – describes the purpose and content of the Final EIS.
- **Chapter 2.0, Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses to Comments** – contains a list of all agencies and persons who submitted comments on the Draft EIS during the public review period, copies of the comment letters submitted on the Draft EIS, and individual responses to the comments.
- **Chapter 3.0, Errata** – presents corrections and revisions to the text of the Draft EIS based on issues raised by comments, clarifications, corrections, or minor changes to the Proposed Action. Changes in the text are shown by ~~strikeouts~~ where text is removed and by underline where text is added.
- **Chapter 4.0, References** – lists the references cited in the above chapters.
- **Chapter 5.0, List of Preparers** – identifies the USACE and consultant staff involved in the preparation of this Final EIS.

### 1.10 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.0-1 below presents a summary of the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and for effects determined to be significant, it also presents feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce the significant effects.

**Table 1.0-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<i>Aesthetics</i>						
<b>Impact AES-1: Effect on Scenic Vistas</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is feasible.</i>	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
<b>Impact AES-2: Effect on Scenic Resources</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact AES-3: Degradation of Visual Character</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is feasible.</i>	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact AES-4: Effects from New Sources of Light and Glare</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AES-4a</b>                      <b>Site Lighting to Minimize Nuisance</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AES-4b</b>                      <b>Disclosure Requirements</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AES-4c</b>                      <b>Use of Low Glare Materials for New Development</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AES-4d</b>                      <b>Avoid Light Spill Over into Curry Creek and Open Space Areas</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of building permits for all phases</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning and Public Works Departments (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4)</p>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<i>Agricultural Resources</i>						
Impact AG-1: Conversion of Agricultural Land	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AG-1                      Agricultural Compensation</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>One acre of open space will be preserved within Placer County for each acre of open space 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 the purposes of assessing impacts associated with a specific development project, “open space” impacts shall include all land proposed to be developed for urban uses. For purposes of mitigation for the specific development project, 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, as determined by the Planning Director, of the mitigation lands acquired 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 property at issue, or (3) are undeveloped and have the same or higher value CDC categorization as lands being affected within the Specific Plan property at issue.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final maps</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact AG-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Agricultural Uses</b>	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AG-2                      Deed Disclosure regarding Agricultural Uses</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>In order to reduce potential conflicts between sensitive uses and agricultural uses, residential units within 100-feet of undeveloped parcels to the west of the SVSP area where agricultural uses exist shall be provided with a deed disclosure or similar notice approved by the City Attorney regarding the proximity and nature of neighboring potential agricultural uses. This disclosure shall be applied at the tentative map state to the affected properties. A written disclosure shall be supplied to the property purchaser or renter by the vendor prior to the completion of the purchase or rental agreement, until such time that the uses are converted to urban development. The text of the disclosure language shall be approved by the City Attorney.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final maps</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						



Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, all applicants shall submit construction plans denoting the proposed schedule and projected equipment use. Construction contractors shall provide evidence that low emission mobile construction will be used, or that their use was investigated and found to be infeasible for the project. Low emission equipment is defined as meeting the California Air Resources Board’s Tier III standards. Contractors shall also conform to any construction measures imposed by the PCAPCD as well as City Planning Staff. This measure will primarily reduce ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 exhaust emissions.</i></li> <li>• <i>Paints and coating shall be applied either by hand or by high volume, low-pressure spray. This measure will reduce evaporative ROG emissions.</i></li> <li>• <i>All construction shall comply with the following measures to reduce fugitive dust related emissions of PM10 and PM2.5:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard on soil haul trucks or cover payloads using tarps or other suitable means.</i></li> <li>– <i>Suspend grading operations during high winds (greater than 15 mph).</i></li> <li>– <i>Sweep streets as necessary if silt is carried off site to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.</i></li> <li>– <i>Dispose of surplus excavated material in accordance with local ordinances and use sound engineering practices.</i></li> <li>– <i>Schedule activities to minimize the amounts of exposed excavated soil during and after the end of work periods.</i></li> <li>– <i>Phase grading into smaller areas to prevent the susceptibility of larger areas to erosion over extended periods of time.</i></li> <li>– <i>Pave or apply gravel to any on-site haul roads.</i></li> <li>– <i>Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and water.</i></li> <li>– <i>Clean earth moving construction equipment with water or sweep clean, once per day, or as necessary (e.g., when moving on site), consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Best Management Practices and the Roseville Grading Ordinance. Water shall be applied to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts off site. Operational water truck(s), shall be on site, as required, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned, as needed, to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off site.</i></li> <li>– <i>Spread soil binders on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas. Soil binders shall be non-toxic in accordance with state and local regulations. Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers, or vegetated mats, etc. according to manufacturers’ specifications, to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours).</i></li> <li>– <i>Minimize diesel idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes.</i></li> <li>– <i>Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators, if feasible.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– An applicant representative, ARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely (i.e., once per week) evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement for projects grading more than 20 acres in size, regardless of how many acres are to be disturbed daily.</li> <li>– Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed the PCAPCD Visible Emissions Rule 202. Fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond property boundary at any time. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.</li> </ul>						
<p>The City of Roseville is currently working with the Placer County Pollution Control District to update the standard mitigation measures. The following measures will likely be required at the time specific development is proposed.</p>						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1a. Prior to approval of Grading/plans the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. The plan must be submitted by certified mail, or receive a date stamp or other submittal proof. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of APCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan. If the applicant has submittal proof of submittal and no response is received from the District within 20 working days the plan shall be deemed complete, and construction may begin.</li> <li>1b. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the APCD prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.</li> <li>1c. Prior to approval of Grading/Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Placer County APCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt; 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.</li> <li>2. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: If required by the Public Works Department, the contractor shall hold a preconstruction meeting prior to grading activities. The contractor shall invite the Placer County APCD to the pre-construction meeting in order to discuss the construction emission/dust control plan with employees and/or contractors.</li> </ol>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
						<p>3. Prior to building permit approval, the applicant shall show, on the plans submitted to the Building Department, that electrical outlets shall be installed on the exterior walls of both the front and back of all residences or all commercial buildings to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment.</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. Prior to building permit approval, in accordance with District Rule 225, only US EPA Phase II certified wood burning devices shall be allowed in single-family residences. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed a cumulative total of 7.5 grams per hour for all devices. Masonry fireplaces shall have either an EPA certified Phase II wood burning device or shall be a U.L. Listed Decorative Gas Appliance. (Rule 225)</p> <p>6. Wood burning or Pellet appliances shall not be permitted in multi-family developments. Only natural gas or propane fired fireplace appliances are permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the Floor Plans submitted in conjunction with the Building Permit application. (Rule 225/section 302.2)</p> <p>7. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall show that all flat roofs with parapets shall include a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demands.</p> <p>8. Diesel trucks shall be prohibited from idling more than 5 minutes. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall show that all truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208 volt power outlet for every two dock doors. Diesel Trucks idling for more than 5 minutes shall be required to connect to the 110/208 volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. 2-foot x3-foot signage which indicates "Diesel engine Idling Limited to a Maximum of 5 Minutes" shall be shown on the building elevations and shall be submitted to the Placer County APCD prior to the issuance of Building Permits for the project.</p> <p>9. Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, an enforcement plan shall be established, and submitted to the APCD for review, in order to evaluate project-related on-and-off- road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities on a weekly basis, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. An Environmental Coordinator, hired by the prime contractor or property owner, and who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194).</p> <p>PCAPCD Rules (Existing District requirements to be added as construction notes or referenced in conditions of approval)</p> <p><b>New Standard Condition of Approval (for all projects):</b> The project shall comply with all applicable Placer County Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations, and shall obtain applicable permits and/or clearances from the District prior to the start of construction.</p>

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p>The following air quality notes shall be added to the grading and/or improvement plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contractor shall use CARB ultra low sulfur diesel fuel for all diesel– powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment. (California Standards for Motor Vehicle Diesel Fuel, title 13, article 4.8, chapter 9, California Code of Regulations).</li> <li>• Processes that discharge 2 pounds per day or more of air contaminants, as defined by Health and Safety Code Section 39013, to the atmosphere may require a permit. Permits are required for both construction and operation. Developers/contractors should contact the District prior to construction and obtain any necessary permits prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. (Rule 501)</li> <li>• Pursuant to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 501, General Permit Requirements, the proposed project may need a permit from the District prior to construction. In general, any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower or any boiler with heat greater than 1,000,000 Btu per hour shall require a permit issued by the District. (Rule 501)</li> <li>• All on-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 hp or greater shall either obtain a state issued portable equipment permit or a Placer County APCD issued portable equipment permit. (California Portable Equipment Registration Program, Section 2452).</li> <li>• The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators if feasible.</li> <li>• During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.</li> <li>• During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. (Rule 228/section 401.2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Public Works and Planning Departments (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4); Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Occupancy/Operation</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AQ-2                      Project Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></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, as found to be in compliance with the 30 percent reduction analysis applicable for individual projects with the Specific Plan, 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 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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Require all flat roofs on non-residential structures to have a white or silver cap sheet to reduce energy demand.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide conductive/inductive electric vehicle charging station and signage prohibiting parking for non-electric vehicles within designated spaces within non-residential developments.</i></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Design streets to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops.</i></li> </ul>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Require site design to maximize access to transit lines, to accommodate bus travel, and to provide lighted shelters at transit access points.</i></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Include photovoltaic systems in project design and/or participate in Roseville Electric incentive programs for energy-efficient development where feasible.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Measures for Detached Single-Family Residences:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Require installation of a gas outlet in the rear of residential buildings for use of outdoor cooking appliances, such as gas burning barbeques.</i></li> <li>• <i>Require installation of low nitrogen oxide (NOx) hot water heaters (beyond District Rule 246 requirements)</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide notice to homebuyers of incentive and rebate programs available through Roseville Electric or other providers that encourage the purchase of electric landscape maintenance equipment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Prior to approval of Tentative Maps provide notice to homebuyers through CC&amp;Rs or other mechanisms to inform them that only gas fireplaces would be permitted. Where propane or natural gas service is not available, only EPA Phase II certified wood-burning devices shall be allowed in single-family residences. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed 7.5 grams per hour. Woodburning or Pellet appliances shall not be permitted in multi-family developments.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Public Works and Planning Departments (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4); Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact AQ-3: CO Hotspots</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact AQ-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(am)

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AQ-4a</b></p> <p><b>Risk Assessment and Site Specific Measures</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p>Users that could generate toxic air contaminants will be required to submit a Permit to Operate to the PCAPCD. The District will review the use and if a proposed project would cause the combined emissions of TACs to exceed the risk standard of 10 in 1 million at residences or public uses (schools, parks, etc.), additional modeling and/or environmental review would be required to demonstrate emissions from that use or other uses would be reduced so that the standard is not exceeded. For example, an applicant could propose to retrofit an existing operation in order to lower the total TAC emissions in the SVSP area.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AQ-4b</b></p> <p><b>Screening Health Risk Assessment</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and On-Site Alternatives)</i></p> <p>A screening health risk assessment shall be conducted if the approval or residential uses occurs subsequent to approval of the commercial area within the Placer Vineyard Specific Plan area and that commercial area allows for industrial land uses. If the screening analysis shows potential significant health risks, then a more detailed health risk assessment should be conducted. If significant acute, chronic, or carcinogenic health risks are predicted, then measures shall be identified that reduce all health risks to less than significant levels. Such analysis and mitigation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use and site design requirements including building setbacks and building orientation.</li> <li>• Consideration of the distance between industrial uses (emissions) and the location of potential sensitive receptors and implementation of setbacks to maximize distance.</li> <li>• Application of scrubbers or other modifications to industrial uses to further reduce emissions.</li> <li>• Limitations on outdoor use in non-residential areas used by sensitive receptors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Public Works and Planning Departments (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4); Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p>						
<p><b>Impact AQ-5: Exposure to Objectionable Odors</b></p> <p><b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b></p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Biological Resources</b>						
<b>Impact BIO-1: Loss of Wetlands through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption or Other Means</b>  NA <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  PA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>Mitigation described below.</i>	LTS(m)	NE	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a Wetland Compensatory Mitigation</b> <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action)</b>  <i>To mitigate for the unavoidable loss of wetlands and other waters of the US, the Applicants will develop and implement a wetlands mitigation plan that will consist of preservation, restoration, and establishment of wetlands on the project site and purchase of vernal pool creation/restoration and preservation credits, and/or provide permittee-responsible preservation and/or restoration at an off-site location. <b>Table 3.4-9, Proposed Action Wetlands Impacts and Mitigation Area Summary</b>, presents acres of wetlands that would be affected under the Proposed Action and acres of wetlands that would be created or preserved under the Applicant’s proposed conceptual mitigation plan.</i>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><i>On-Site Preservation and Restoration</i></p> <p>The conceptual mitigation plan proposes preservation of 13.7 acres of wetlands and other waters of the US on the project site in perpetuity and managed to maintain their resource functions and values. These would be preserved within the designated open space on the project site. The open space areas include stream corridors of Curry Creek and Federico Creek and wetlands in close proximity to these streams. Approximately 100-foot buffers would be established along the two corridors to minimize indirect impacts to the preserved wetlands from the Proposed Action.</p> <p><i>On-Site Wetlands Creation</i></p> <p>The proposed on-site wetlands creation plan for the Proposed Action is shown in <b>Figure 3.4-8, Proposed On-Site Wetlands Creation</b>. The on-site wetland creation is designed to compensate for impacts to streams, ponds, perennial marsh, seasonal wetland swales, and a portion of the impacts to seasonal wetlands. In addition to providing partial replacement of wetland losses, it is also designed to restore, as much as possible, the function of the preserved streams that have been degraded by historic agricultural practices and upstream development.</p> <p>According to the conceptual mitigation plan, a total of 28.24 acres of wetlands will be constructed on the project site. The wetlands will be located on low terraces excavated adjacent to the existing stream channels along the inside of stream meanders and along relatively straight reaches so as to avoid being intercepted by the natural meandering of the creek channel.</p> <p><i>Off-Site Creation/Restoration and Preservation</i></p> <p>According to the conceptual mitigation plan, the Applicants will provide permittee-responsible preservation and/or restoration at an off-site location or secure creation/restoration credits for 7.98 acres of constructed vernal pools and preservation credits for 14.93 acres of vernal pools from an approved mitigation bank in western Placer County within the bank’s approved service area.</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1b</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Wetland Mitigation Plan</b> <i>(Applicability – Alternatives 1 through 4)</i></p> <p><i>A wetlands mitigation plan similar to the Applicant’s proposed mitigation described above for the Proposed Action will be implemented in conjunction with each alternative. The plan will incorporate similar elements, including preservation and creation of wetlands on-site, as well as permittee-responsible preservation and/or restoration at an off-site location or purchase of constructed vernal pool creation/restoration credits and preservation credits by the Applicants. The USACE would require detailed, specific mitigation plans for a given alternative and would evaluate the specifics of this plan to determine the actual mitigation requirement based on a number of factors, including functions, location, change in surface area, uncertainty or risk of failure, and temporal loss of function.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities for any project development phase containing wetland features.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>					
<b>Impact BIO-2: Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Their Habitat</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-2a</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Implement Permit Conditions</b> <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>No project construction shall proceed on the project until a biological opinion (BO) has been issued by USFWS. The USACE will consult with the USFWS and incorporate the BO conditions into the terms and conditions of the DA permits. The project applicant(s) will abide by permit conditions (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicants will not be required to complete this mitigation measure for direct or indirect impacts that have already been mitigated to the satisfaction of USFWS through another BO or mitigation plan.</i></p>					

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-2b</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures to Avoid and Minimize Long-Term Effects on Preserved/Avoided Crustacean Habitat</b></p> <p><i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Prior to initiation of any work in waters of the U.S. for any particular phase of a project pursuant to its corresponding Department of the Army Permit, the primary open space within that phase shall be preserved with a Deed Restriction with permanent legal protection. Within three months following completion of a grading of the secondary open space bordering the primary open space, the secondary open space will be established as separate level parcel(s) with permanent legal protection.</i></li> <li>• <i>After each phase of the on-site mitigation has been constructed, monitored for the required period, and been determined to be successful, the parcel(s) comprising that mitigation will be accepted by the City of Roseville who will then be solely responsible for its long-term maintenance consistent with the provisions of the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In the event that a permittee elects to develop an off-site permittee-sponsored mitigation plan in lieu of purchase of wetland preservation and/or creation credits from an approved mitigation bank, that plan will be prepared and submitted to the Corps of Engineers for approval prior to initiation of work in waters of the U.S. under the corresponding Department of the Army Permit. That plan must provide for the long-term management of the mitigation area and include a long-term funding mechanism. <b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, and on an ongoing basis throughout construction as applicable for all project phases.</i></p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						
<p><b>Impact BIO-3: Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species</b></p> <p><b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b></p> <p><i>No mitigation is required.</i></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<p><b>Impact BIO-4: Effects on Federally Listed Amphibian and Reptile Species</b></p> <p>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3 <i>No mitigation is required.</i></p> <p>A4 <i>Mitigation described below.</i></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-4 Giant Garter Snake Impact Mitigation</b> <i>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</i></p> <p><i>The Applicants shall develop a mitigation plan that is designed to avoid take of the species. The plan would be implemented during construction within giant garter snake aquatic and upland habitat on the alternative site.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of Giant Garter Snake habitat as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact BIO-5: Effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  <b>A4</b> <i>Mitigation described below.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-5 Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB)</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <p><i>Prior to any ground disturbing or construction activities within 100 feet of the identified elderberry shrub, the Applicants shall consult with the USFWS. The Applicants shall install and maintain a 4-foot-high construction fence around the perimeter of the elderberry shrub. No grading or any other ground disturbing activities shall be conducted within the fenced protected area without prior verification that the requirements of the USFWS have been satisfied, including the issuance of any necessary permits.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicants shall avoid and protect the VELB habitat (elderberry stalks 1 inch in diameter or greater) where feasible. Where avoidance is infeasible, the Applicants shall develop and implement a VELB mitigation plan in accordance with the most current USFWS mitigation guidelines for unavoidable take of VELB habitat pursuant to either Section 7 or Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act. The mitigation plan shall include, but might not be limited to, relocation of elderberry shrubs, planting of elderberry shrubs, and monitoring of relocated and planted elderberry shrubs.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of VELB habitat as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact BIO-6: Effects on State Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-6 Relocate Western Spadefoot Toad</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>The location of pools that are occupied by western spadefoot toad shall be determined through surveys conducted during the appropriate season (generally February) by a qualified biologist. Those pools that are found to support western spadefoot toad shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, the CDFW shall be consulted for its recommendation with respect to an adult or larval or egg masses capture and relocation plan.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> 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><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact BIO-7: Effects on Protected Raptor Species and Other Nesting Birds</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-7                      Protection of Nesting Sites</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>To ensure that fully protected bird and raptor species are not injured or disturbed by construction in the vicinity of nesting habitat, the Applicants shall implement the following measures:</i></p> <p><i>Raptors</i></p> <p><i>a) If a nest of a legally protected species is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall occur between August 30th and February 15<sup>th</sup> or until the adults and young of the year are no longer dependent on the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist.</i></p> <p><i>b) When feasible, all tree removal shall occur outside the nesting season to avoid the breeding season of any raptor species that could be using the area, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of an upcoming construction area.</i></p> <p><i>c) For Swainson’s hawk, if avoidance of tree removal outside the breeding season is not feasible, and an active nest is present, the Applicants will be required to obtain a 2081 permit from CDFW to mitigate for potential “take” under CESA. If no active nesting is occurring, a take permit would not be required.</i></p> <p><i>d) Prior to the beginning of mass grading, including grading for major infrastructure improvements, during the period between February 15<sup>th</sup> and August 30<sup>th</sup>, all trees and potential burrowing owl habitat within 350 feet of any grading or earthmoving activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests or burrows by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to disturbance. If active raptor nests or burrows are found, and the nest or burrow is within 350 feet of potential construction activity, a highly visible temporary fence shall be erected around the tree or burrow(s) at a distance of up to 350 feet, depending on the species, from the edge of the canopy to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions on the nest area.</i></p> <p><i>e) Preconstruction and non-breeding season burrowing owl exclusion measures shall be developed in consultation with CDFW, and shall preclude burrowing owl occupation of the portions of the project site subject to disturbance such as grading.</i></p> <p><i>f) No construction vehicles shall be permitted within restricted areas (i.e., raptor protection zones) unless directly related to the management or protection of the legally protected species.</i></p>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><i>Black Rails and Tri-colored Blackbirds</i></p> <p>Prior to earth moving that would disturb marsh habitat, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys to determine whether the California black rail or Tri-colored blackbird is present. If either of these species is found, all earth moving within 250 feet shall stop and measures, including establishing nest protection buffers along both sides of Curry Creek during the nesting season (generally February 1 through August 31<sup>st</sup>) shall be implemented.</p> <p><i>Rookeries</i></p> <p>Prior to earthmoving that would disturb marsh habitat or tree removal of the eucalyptus grove, pre-construction surveys should be conducted to verify that no rookeries have been established. If rookeries are found to be present, all earth moving within 250 feet shall stop during the breeding season.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> 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><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Departments (A4)</p>						
<p><b>Impact BIO-8: Effects on State Special-Status Bats</b></p> <p><b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b></p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><b>Impact BIO-9: Effects on Wildlife Movement</b></p> <p><b>A4</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3</b> Mitigation described below.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-9 Wildlife Movement Protection Policies</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action, No Action, and Alternatives 1 through 3)</i></p> <p><i>To protect the long-term habitat of the stream channels and the WAPA corridor and their potential use by wildlife as movement corridors, the Applicants shall ensure that movement corridors are not obstructed and human intrusion into the corridor is minimized. In compliance with Section 1600 of the CDFW Code, the Applicant(s) will enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to conducting any construction activities within a stream corridor, which sets forth mitigation measures that the Applicant must implement. These measures shall include, but not be limited to: the use of either bridges or culverts that are large enough that wildlife have enough space to pass through road crossings 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. Furthermore, the recreational trails shall be lined by post and cable fence and signage shall be used to direct trail users to stay within the designated trail corridor and discourage access to the riparian habitat by humans and pets. The trails shall be closed after dark and no exterior lighting shall be used.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, ground-disturbing activities, project construction, and during project operation as applicable.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> California Department of Fish and Wildlife; City of Roseville Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact BIO-10: Loss of Riparian Habitat</b>  <b>A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3</b> <i>Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-9.</i>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	NE
<b>Impact BIO-11: Effects on On-Site Fish Species</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact BIO-12: Effects on Fish Habitat from Water Diversions</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b><i>Climate Change</i></b>						
<b>Impact GHG-1: GHG Emissions due to Construction</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1.</i>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact GHG-2: GHG Emissions due to Operation/Occupancy</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure GHG-2a                      Air Quality Measures</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 from the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville. Implementation of the Air Quality Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, listed in Section 4.4 Air Quality, would reduce operational and construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, and would also act to reduce GHG emissions associated with project construction and operation. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 is relevant to Impact 4.5-1 because both criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions are frequently associated with combustion byproducts. In addition, the City shall implement the following measures to reduce direct and indirect GHG emissions associated with the SVSP. Certain measures are already components of the project (i.e., Specific Plan policies, design guidelines, and standards) and/or would be applied consistent with the City’s General Plan Policies, addressing GHG emissions and climate change, but are provided here for purposes of completeness.</i></p>						
<p><b>Mitigation Measure GHG-2b                      Additional Measures to Reduce GHG Emissions</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>Each increment of new development within the project site requiring a discretionary approval (e.g., proposed tentative subdivision map, conditional use permit), shall demonstrate that GHG emissions from project construction and operation will be reduced by 30% from business-as-usual emissions levels projected for 2025.</i></p> <p><i>For each increment of new development, the City shall submit to the developer, a list of potentially feasible GHG reduction measures to be considered in the construction and design of that portion of the project. The City’s list of potentially feasible GHG reduction measures shall reflect the then-current state of the regulation of GHG emissions and climate change, which is expected to continue to evolve under the mandate of AB 32. The developer shall then submit to the City a mitigation plan that lists the measures selected to be implemented as part of the project and contains an analysis demonstrating the associated reduction in GHG emissions. The report shall also demonstrate why measures not selected are considered infeasible. The City shall review the mitigation report for the applicable increment of development and approve the report (with modifications, if considered necessary and feasible) prior to granting any requested discretionary approval for that increment of development.</i></p>						

<b>Resource Topic/Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<p><i>In determining what sort of measures should appropriately be imposed by a local government under the circumstances, the City shall consider the following factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The extent to which rates of GHG emissions generated by motor vehicles traveling to, from, and within the project site are projected to decrease over time as a result of regulations, policies, and/or plans that have already been adopted or may be adopted in the future by the Air Resources Board (ARB) or other public agency pursuant to AB 32, or by EPA;</i></li> <li><i>The extent to which mobile-source GHG emissions, which at the time of writing this EIR comprise a substantial portion of the state's GHG inventory, can also be reduced through design measures that result in trip reductions and reductions in trip length;</i></li> <li><i>The extent to which GHG emissions emitted by the mix of power generation operated by Roseville Electric, that will serve the project site, are projected to decrease pursuant to the Renewable Portfolio Standard required by SB 1078 and SB 107, as well as any future regulations, policies, and/or plans adopted by the federal and state governments that reduce GHG emissions from power generation;</i></li> <li><i>The extent to which replacement of CCR Title 24 with the California Green Building Standards Code or other similar requirements will result in new buildings being more energy efficient and consequently more GHG efficient;</i></li> <li><i>The extent to which any stationary sources of GHG emissions that would be operated on a proposed land use (e.g., industrial) are already subject to regulations, policies, and/or plans that reduce GHG emissions, particularly any future regulations that will be developed as part of ARB's implementation of AB 32, or other pertinent regulations on stationary sources that have the indirect effect of reducing GHG emissions;</i></li> <li><i>The extent to which the feasibility of existing GHG reduction technologies may change in the future, and to which innovation in GHG reduction technologies will continue, affecting cost-benefit analyses that determine economic feasibility; and</i></li> <li><i>Whether the total costs of proposed mitigation for GHG emissions, together with other mitigation measures, required for the proposed development, are so great that a reasonably prudent property owner would not proceed with the project in the face of such costs.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In considering how much, and what kind of, mitigation is necessary in light of these factors, the City shall consider the following list of options, though the list is not intended to be exhaustive, as GHG reduction strategies and their respective feasibility are likely to evolve over time. These measures are derived from multiple sources including the Mitigation Measure Summary in Appendix B of the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper, CEQA &amp; Climate Change (CAPCOA 2008), and the California Attorney General's Office (2008).</i></p>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><b>Energy Efficiency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Include clean alternative energy features to promote energy self-sufficiency (e.g., photovoltaic cells, solar thermal electricity systems, small wind turbines).</i></li> <li>• <i>Design buildings to meet CEC Tier II requirements (e.g., exceeding the requirements of the Title 24 (as of 2007) by 35 percent).</i></li> <li>• <i>Site buildings to take advantage of shade and prevailing winds and design landscaping and sun screens to reduce energy use.</i></li> <li>• <i>Install efficient lighting in all buildings (including residential). Also install lighting control systems, where practical. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in all buildings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Install light-colored “cool” pavements, and strategically located shade trees along all bicycle and pedestrian routes.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>SVSP developers shall be encouraged incorporate “green building” points into the construction and design of all (additions of 25,000 square feet of office/retail commercial or 100,000 square feet of industrial floor area) projects that incorporate “green building” points in construction. Such points may be achieved through checklists identified by New Home Construction Green Building Guidelines available at <a href="http://www.builditgreen.org">www.builditgreen.org</a>, or through a similar list that distinguishes specific measures targeting efficiencies in energy, resource use, or other measures that would also directly or indirectly result in GHG emission reductions. Specific efficiencies that would reduce GHG emissions shall be implemented where feasible, for all project areas including site design, landscaping, foundation, structural frame and building envelope, exterior finishing, plumbing, appliance use, insulation, heating, venting and air conditioning, building performance, use of renewable energy, finishes, and flooring.</i></p> <p><i>SVSP developers shall be encouraged to incorporate any combination of the following strategies to reduce heat gain for 50 percent of the non-roof impervious site landscape (including roads, sidewalks, courtyards, parking lots, and driveways) into the construction and design of all new (additions of 25,000 square feet of office/retail commercial) projects:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Shaded (Within five years of occupancy)</i></li> <li>• <i>Paving materials with a Solar Reflective Index (SRI) of at least 29</i></li> <li>• <i>Open grid pavement system (pavement that is less than 50 percent impervious and contains vegetation in the open cells)</i></li> </ul>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Parking spaces under cover (defined as underground, under deck, under roof, or under building.) Any roof used to shade or cover parking should have an SRI of at least 29.</i></li> <li>• <i>Optional level of LEED certification, such as silver or gold which can allow for further reductions in energy consumption and GHG emissions.</i></li> </ul>						
<p><b>Water Conservation and Efficiency</b></p>						
<p><i>The SVSP project includes water conservation as part of the project. In addition, the following should be considered:</i></p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>With the exception of ornamental shade trees, use water-efficient landscapes with native, drought-resistant species in all public area and commercial landscaping. Use water-efficient turf in parks and other turf dependent spaces.</i></li> <li>• <i>Install the infrastructure to use recycled water for landscape irrigation (part of the project).</i></li> <li>• <i>Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls. (Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance)</i></li> <li>• <i>Design buildings and lots to be water-efficient. Only install water-efficient fixtures and appliances (e.g., Ultra low-flow toilets, no flow urinals etc.).</i></li> <li>• <i>Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff. Prohibit businesses from using pressure washers for cleaning driveways, parking lots, sidewalks, and street surfaces unless required to mitigate health and safety concerns. These restrictions should be included in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions of the community.</i></li> </ul>						
<p><b>Solid Waste Measures</b></p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste at all buildings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide adequate recycling containers in public areas, including parks, school grounds, paseos, and pedestrian zones in areas of mixed-use development.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.</i></li> </ul>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><b>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote ride sharing programs and employment centers (e.g., by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading zones and waiting areas for ride share vehicles, and providing a web site or message board for coordinating ride sharing).</li> <li>• Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure in all land use types to encourage the use of low or zero emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations).</li> <li>• At commercial land uses, all forklifts, “yard trucks,” or vehicles that are predominately used on site at non-residential land uses shall be electric-powered or powered by biofuels (such as biodiesel [B100]) that are produced from waste products, or shall use other technologies that do not rely on direct fossil fuel consumption.</li> <li>• Implement roundabouts. (30 percent intersection emissions reduction)</li> <li>• Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations) (0.5 to 1.5 percent emissions reduction).</li> <li>• Prioritized parking within new commercial and retail areas shall be given to electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles.</li> <li>• Incorporate bicycle lanes, routes, and intersection improvements into street systems within the Specific Plan (1 percent emissions reduction).</li> <li>• For commercial land uses, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience (1 percent emissions reduction).</li> <li>• Create Class II bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points (1 percent emissions reduction).</li> <li>• Encourage the public school districts to serve the project site with a student busing system, and/or enable students residing in the project to safely walk to or bicycle to school without encountering barriers such as large arterial roadways or sound walls.</li> <li>• Construction of transit facility/amenity (bus shelters, bicycle lockers/racks, etc.) for existing public and private transit (0.5 percent emissions reduction).</li> <li>• Provide secure bicycle storage at public parking facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of all grading plans, throughout project construction, and during project operation, where applicable.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						



<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<i>Geology, Soils, and Minerals</i>						
<b>Impact GEO-1: Hazard associated with Seismic Ground-shaking</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GEO-2: Hazard associated with Liquefaction</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GEO-3: Hazard associated with Slope Failure</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GEO-4: Potential Structural Damage due to Expansive Soils</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GEO-5: Effect on Mineral Resources</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>						
<b>Impact HAZ-1: Exposure to Soil or Groundwater Contamination from Past Uses</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1                      Groundwater Contamination</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>Prior to site development in the SVSP, recommended testing and remediation, if needed shall occur. Groundwater wells shall be properly closed.</i></p> <p><i>If evidence of soil contamination, septic tanks, or other underground storage tanks are encountered in previously unidentified locations in the SVSP area, work shall cease until the area can be tested, and if necessary remediated and/or properly removed or closed. Remediation activities could include removal of contaminated soil and/or on-site treatment. As part of the process, the City shall ensure that any necessary investigation and/or remediation activities are coordinated with the Roseville Fire Department, Placer County Division of Environmental Health, and if needed, other appropriate federal, state, and local agencies. Once a site is remediated, construction can continue.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and during construction activities for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						
<b>Impact HAZ-2: Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>						
<b>Impact HAZ-3: Hazard associated with Adjacent Natural Gas Pipeline</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-4: Risk of Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Transmission Lines</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HAZ-5: Risk related to Use of Recycled Water</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>						
<b>Impact HYDRO-1: Effect related to On- or Off-Site Flood Hazards</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1                      Payment of Drainage Impact Fees</b> <b><i>(Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></b>  <i>The City shall collect the Pleasant Grove Drainage Fee from the applicants prior to the approval of each building permit, which would cover the cost of retention for that development's portion of the Roseville regional retention basin at Reason Farms.</i>  <b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of each building permit.  <b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)						
<b>Impact HYDRO-2: Effects from Construction within a Floodplain</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact HYDRO-3: Exposure to Flood Hazards related to Dam or Levee Failure</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HYDRO-4: Water Quality Effects during Construction</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HYDRO-5: Water Quality Effects from Project Occupancy and Operation</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5 Stormwater Management Standards</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>At the tentative map or site development stage, development shall be conditioned to include source control and treatment control measures to include LID strategies and BMP treatment as required by the City's then current design standards and the City's then current General Phase II NPDES Permit issued by the State. The measures would include, but are not limited to the measures identified above, and in Table IV.B.2 Applicable LID Measures by Development Type, found in the Sierra Vista Drainage and Stormwater Master Plan found in Appendix O of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						
<b>Impact HYDRO-6: Effect of Tertiary Treated Effluent on Pleasant Grove Creek</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact HYDRO-7: Effect on Groundwater Recharge</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HYDRO-8: Effects on Groundwater Basin</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>						
<b>Impact LU-1: Result in Incompatible Land Uses</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure AG-2.</i>	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(am)	LTS(m)
<b>Impact LU-2: Physically Divide an Established Community</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE
<b>Impact LU-3: Conflict with General Plan and Zoning Code</b>  PA, NA, A2, A3 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  A1, A4 <i>No mitigation is feasible.</i>	NE	NE	SU	NE	NE	SU

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact LU-4: Conflict with SACOG Blueprint</b>  <b>PA, A1, A2, A3</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  <b>NA, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is feasible.</i>	LTS	SU	LTS	LTS	LTS	SU
<b>Noise</b>						
<b>Impact NOISE-1: Construction Noise and Vibration</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-1                      Construction Noise Policies</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>Construction activities shall comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Locate fixed construction equipment such as compressors and generators as far 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></li> <li><i>Designate a construction disturbance coordinator and conspicuously post the Coordinator’s contact information around the project site and in adjacent public spaces. The disturbance coordinator will receive all public complaints about construction noise disturbances, and will be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint, and implementing any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem.</i></li> <li><i>Well drilling shall occur prior to construction of the adjacent subdivision, to the extent feasible. If construction timing for the wells occurs after subdivision construction, then measures to reduce noise shall include hanging flexible sound control curtains around the drilling apparatus, and the drill rig, to the degree feasible, as determined by the City, if located within 1,000 feet (305 kilometers) of an occupied residence.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> During all phases of project construction.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact NOISE-2: Noise from On-Site Activities</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2a                      Commercial Noise Controls</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>For commercial uses within 150 feet (46 meters) of residential uses, the applicants shall implement the following or equally effective measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In general, where commercial land uses adjoin residential property lines, the following measures should be included in the design of the commercial use. If the primary noise sources are parking lots, HVAC equipment and light truck deliveries, then 6- to 7-foot-tall masonry walls shall be constructed to provide adequate isolation of parking lot and delivery truck activities. HVAC equipment shall be located either at ground level, or when located on rooftops the building facades shall include parapets for shielding.</i></li> <li>• <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 project design:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Loading docks and truck delivery areas shall maintain a minimum distance of 30 feet from residential property lines.</i></li> <li>– <i>Property line barriers shall be 6 to 8 feet (1.8 to 2.4 meters) in height. Circulation routes for trucks shall be located a minimum of 30 feet (9 meters) from residential property lines.</i></li> <li>– <i>All heating, cooling, and ventilation equipment shall be located within mechanical rooms where possible.</i></li> <li>– <i>All heating, cooling, and ventilation equipment shall be shielded from view with solid barriers.</i></li> <li>– <i>Emergency generators shall comply with the local noise criteria at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers.</i></li> <li>– <i>In cases where loading docks or truck delivery circulation routes are located less than 100 feet (30 meters) from residential property lines, an acoustical evaluation shall be submitted to verify compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Level Performance Standards.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2b</b>	<p><b>Attenuate Park Noise</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i>  <i>Activities at the proposed community-wide park shall be scheduled to occur during daytime hours (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public address (PA) systems shall be designed, installed, and tested to comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Municipal Code Noise Ordinance at the nearest sensitive receptors.</li> <li>Wood fencing, or 160-foot (49 meters) setbacks adjacent to active recreation areas, shall be included in the project design where neighborhood parks abut residential uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>					
<b>Impact NOISE-3a: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2025) (On-site Sensitive Receptors)</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-3a</b>	<p><b>Traffic Noise Attenuation</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Masonry walls and/or landscaped berms shall be constructed along the major project-area roadways adjacent to proposed residential uses if acoustical studies warrant sound attenuation, otherwise standard wood fencing is acceptable. Table 4.6-10 data from the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville shall be consulted to determine appropriate barrier heights. If the assumptions shown in Table 4.6-10 vary considerably, a detailed analysis of exterior and interior mitigation measures should be conducted when tentative maps become available.</li> <li>In areas requiring sound attenuation, noise barrier walls shall be constructed of concrete panels, concrete masonry units, earthen berms, or any combination of these materials. Wood is not recommended for construction due to eventual warping and degradation of acoustical performance.</li> <li>Tentative map applications for residential uses located along Fiddymont Road shall be required to include an analysis of interior noise levels. The report shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer and shall specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA, NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>					

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<p><b>Impact NOISE-3b: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2025) (Off-site sensitive receptors)</b></p> <p>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3 <i>No mitigation is feasible.</i></p> <p>A4 <i>Mitigation described below.</i></p>	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-3b Traffic Noise Attenuation (Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Tentative map applications for residential uses on the Alternative 4 site shall be required to include an analysis of noise levels at on-site and off-site sensitive receptor locations. The reports shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical engineer and shall specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the Placer County standards for interior and exterior noise levels. Exterior and interior masonry walls and/or landscaped berms shall be constructed if acoustical studies indicate that sound attenuation is required. Data from the acoustical studies shall be consulted to determine appropriate barrier heights.</i></li> <li><i>In areas requiring sound attenuation, noise barrier walls shall be constructed of concrete panels, concrete masonry units, earthen berms, or any combination of these materials. Wood is not recommended for construction due to eventual warping and degradation of acoustical performance.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Placer County Planning Department</p>						
<p><b>Impact NOISE-4: Aviation Noise</b></p> <p>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<i>Public Services</i>						
<b>Impact PUB-1: Demand for Law Enforcement Services</b>  PA, NA, A1, A2, A3 <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure PUB-1                      Funding for Police Service Impacts</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <p><i>The Applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding for law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Placer County Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact PUB-2: Demand for Fire Protection Services</b> <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  <b>A4</b> <i>Mitigation described below.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure PUB-2                      Funding for Fire Protection Service Impacts</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <p><i>The Applicants shall establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Placer County Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact PUB-3: Demand for School Facilities</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact PUB-4: Demand for Library Services</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>  <b>A4</b> <i>Mitigation described below.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure PUB-4                      Funding for Library Services</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <p><i>Formation of a County Service Area, Community Facilities District, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Placer County Planning Department</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>						
<b>Impact TRA-1: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-1a</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of improvements in the City of Roseville CIP</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>Pay Fair Share of Improvements in the CIP including improvements to the following intersections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Fiddymment/Baseline Road: improve intersection as part of the project</i></li> <li>• <i>Watt Avenue/Baseline Road: improve intersection as part of the project</i></li> <li>• <i>Baseline Road: widen to four-lane facility from Fiddymment Road to western Specific Plan Boundary.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Improvements would be necessary to the following intersections, as part of the project to achieve acceptable service levels under the 2025 CIP plus Project scenario. However, as noted, many intersections cannot be mitigated because of constraints.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Foothills Boulevard and Baseline Road: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>2. <i>Industrial Avenue and Alantown Drive: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>3. <i>Cirby Way and Northridge Drive: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>4. <i>Foothills Boulevard and Junction Boulevard: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>5. <i>Junction Boulevard and Baseline Road: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>6. <i>Roseville Parkway and Sierra College Boulevard: No feasible mitigation</i></li> <li>7. <i>Blue Oaks Boulevard and Crocker Ranch Road: Re-stripe to include two south bound to east bound left turn lanes and a separate right turn. This improvement will be added to the City of Roseville’s Capital Improvement program. Development within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area will be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement</i></li> <li>8. <i>Blue Oaks Boulevard and New Meadow Drive: Re-stripe the southbound through lane to a shared through and left-turn lane. This improvement will be added to the City of Roseville’s Capital Improvement program. Development within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area will be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement. As such, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.</i></li> </ol>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p>9. Foothills Boulevard and Baseline/Main: No feasible mitigation</p> <p>10. Sunrise Boulevard and Sandringham/Kensington: add a dedicated southbound right-turn lane</p> <p>11. Woodcreek Oaks and Baseline Road: construction of a second eastbound through lane. This improvement is currently in the City's CIP program. SVSP would be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement.</p> <p>The SVSP will develop over a period of years. Therefore, the impacts on these intersections would occur over a period of time. As with other improvements in the 2025 CIP, the City will monitor traffic conditions and determine when specific improvements are needed. The City of Roseville's traffic impact fees should be revised to include the SVSP area. Specific Plans and/or development proposals shall provide for fair share contributions of the cost of the improvements through the updated traffic impact fees.</p> <p>Construction of intersection improvements could have impacts on biological and cultural resources, air quality, water quality, and noise levels. These impacts will be evaluated as part of the CIP update to incorporate the adopted mitigation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-1b</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the improvements to City of Roseville intersections</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</b></p> <p>The proposed development will pay its fair share of the cost of necessary improvements (if feasible) to the City of Roseville intersections by paying traffic impact fees to the City of Roseville. The City will monitor traffic conditions and determine when specific improvements are needed.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Planning Department (PA,NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact TRA-2: Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections and Roadway Segments</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-2a</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County roadway segments</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action, No Action, and Alternatives 1 through 3)</b></p> <p><i>Baseline Road, west of Watt Avenue: Sierra Vista would participate in the City/County Joint Fee Program that would fund this improvement. As such this impact would be considered less than significant.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road: This segment is not included within the existing City/County Fee Program.</i></li> <li>• <i>Walerga Road south of Baseline: This segment is not included within the existing City/County Fee Program.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The City shall determine the means of providing the project’s fair share to fund these improvements with Placer County through the inter-agency agreement or other arrangement required by Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville.</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-2b</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of Walerga Road and PFE Road intersection improvements</b>  <b>(Applicability – Alternatives 3 and 4)</b></p> <p><i>The proposed development will pay its fair share of the cost of necessary improvements to the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road by paying traffic impact fees to Placer County. The County will monitor traffic conditions and determine when specific improvements are needed. Potential improvements to address this impact include two northbound and southbound through lanes, as well as two southbound and eastbound left turn lanes to accommodate the additional traffic accessing the site.</i></p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-2c</b></p> <p><i>The proposed development will pay its fair share of the cost of necessary improvements to the intersection of Baseline Road and Brewer Road by paying traffic impact fees to Placer County. The County will monitor traffic conditions and determine when specific improvements are needed. Potential improvements to address this impact include two northbound and southbound through lanes, as well as two southbound and eastbound left turn lanes to accommodate the additional traffic accessing the site.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Placer County; City of Roseville Planning Department</p>	<p><b>Pay fair share of the cost of Baseline Road and Brewer Road intersection improvements</b></p> <p><i>(Applicability – Alternative 4)</i></p>					

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<p><b>Impact TRA-3: Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Intersections and Roadway Segments</b></p> <p>NA, A1, A2, A3, A4 <i>No mitigation is required.</i></p> <p>PA <i>Mitigation described below.</i></p>	SU(m)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-3</b>      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County roadway segments</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Walerga Road</i></li> <li>• <i>Watt Avenue</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Consistent with Placer County’s Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and Mitigation Measure 6.12-1 for the Regional University Specific Plan, which require Placer County to attempt to enter into an agreement with Sacramento County in order to mitigate the significant effects of the those two Placer County projects within Sacramento County, the City of Roseville shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a fair agreement with Sacramento County regarding Sierra Vista’s fair share mitigation for this improvement. In reaching an accommodation with Sacramento County, the City and Sacramento County, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or Joint Powers Authority additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Placer County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the City strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the City shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SVSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the City’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just Sacramento County or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</i></p>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><i>The City intends that its arrangement(s) with Sacramento County and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (1) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements (e.g., the Curry Creek Community Plan in Placer County); (2) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects; and (3) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. Implementation of MM 4.3-4 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville would reduce impacts to a less than significant level; however, these improvements lie outside the jurisdiction of the City of Roseville.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Sacramento County; City of Roseville Planning Department</p>						
Impact TRA-4: Increased Traffic at Sutter County Intersections and Roadway Segments	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-4</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County roadway segments</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reigo Road and Pleasant Grove South</li> <li>• Riego Road and Pleasant Grove North</li> <li>• Riego Road</li> </ul> <p><i>The City of Roseville shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a fair agreement with Sutter County regarding Sierra Vista’s fair share mitigation for this improvement. In reaching an accommodation with Sutter County, the City and Sutter County, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or Joint Powers Authority additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Placer County, Sacramento County, and Caltrans.</i></p>						

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action (PA)	No Action (NA)	Alternative 1 (A1)	Alternative 2 (A2)	Alternative 3 (A3)	Alternative 4 (A4)
<p><i>As the City strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the City shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SVSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigation the significant effects of such development on the City’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just Sutter County or with additional agencies, shall account for existing interagency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels. The City intends that its arrangement(s) with Sutter County and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (1) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements (e.g., the Curry Creek Community Plan in Placer County); (2) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects; and (3) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. Implementation of MM 4.3-7 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville would reduce impacts to a less than significant level; however, these improvements lie outside the jurisdiction of the City of Roseville. As such, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Sutter County; City of Roseville Planning Department (PA,NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning Department (A4)</p>						
<p><b>Impact TRA-5: Increased Traffic along City of Rocklin Roadway Segments</b></p> <p><b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact TRA-6: Increased Traffic at State Highway Intersections and Segments</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure TRA-6</b>                      <b>Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to state highway segments</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts on I-80, SR 70/99, or SR 65; however, the City is willing to work with Caltrans &amp; the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on these facilities. If and when Caltrans and the City enter into an enforceable agreement, the Project shall pay impact fees to the City of Roseville in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements, consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, Sec. 66000 et seq.).</i></p> <p><i>The City shall determine the means of providing the project's fair share of the funds for these improvements to Caltrans through the inter-agency agreement or other arrangement required by Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the first subdivision map.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Caltrans; Placer County Transportation Planning Agency; City of Roseville Planning Department</p>						
<b>Impact TRA-7: Increased Demand for Local Transit Service</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>						
<b>Impact TRA-8: Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>						
<b>Impact UTIL-1: Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Demand</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UTIL-2: Groundwater Demand Impacts</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UTIL-3: Capacity of Water Treatment and Supply Facilities</b>  <b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact UTIL-4: Impacts from Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Facilities</b>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure UTIL-4                      WWTP Capacity</b>  <b>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</b></p> <p><i>Prior to obtaining building permits in the SVSP, the applicants shall demonstrate to the City that the South Placer Wastewater Authority has approved expansion of the South Placer Wastewater Authority service area boundary to include the SVSP area. The applicants shall participate financially through connection fees in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows. 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 applicants will rely on the City (on behalf of the South Placer Wastewater Authority partners) to construct regional treatment and regional transmission facilities needed to discharge treated wastewater flows from within the service area boundary. In the event the City is unable to obtain the appropriate permits (e.g., NPDES permit) or is unable to complete the required facility expansions, development within the service area boundary may continue until existing capacity has been exhausted, at which time any remaining development will be curtailed until such time that sufficient treatment and discharge capacity becomes available. Further, the applicants and/or the City, as appropriate, shall implement all relevant construction-related mitigation measures for expansion of the plant listed in Appendix H of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR prepared by the City of Roseville and all water quality and aquatic resource mitigation measures applicable to this project as listed in Table 4.12.3-5 of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Public Works and Planning Departments (PA,NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4)</p>						

<i>Resource Topic/Impact</i>	<b>Proposed Action (PA)</b>	<b>No Action (NA)</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (A1)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (A2)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (A3)</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (A4)</b>
<b>Impact UTIL-5: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services</b>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)
<p><b>Mitigation Measure UTIL-5                      Expand the Regional Landfill</b>  <i>(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)</i></p> <p><i>Development in the SVSP Area and Urban Reserve shall pay collection fees to the City of Roseville, a portion of which shall be used to service bonds necessary to fund landfill expansion. As a member of the WPWMA, the City of Roseville can support the expansion of the landfill, as needed; however, the City cannot compel the WPWMA to expand the landfill.</i></p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Roseville Public Works and Planning Departments (PA,NA, A1 through A3); Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments (A4)</p>						
<b>Impact UTIL-6: Increased Demand for Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>PA, NA, A1, A2, A3, A4</b> <i>No mitigation is required.</i>						

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

*NE: No effect*

*LTS: Less than significant, no mitigation*

*LTS(m): Less than significant after mitigation*

*LTS(am): Less than significant, additional mitigation applied*

*SU: Significant effect, no mitigation feasible*

*SU(m): Significant residual effect after mitigation*