CHAPTER 3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed Life Time Fitness Project (proposed project) in the City of Roseville (City). The proposed project includes development of a fitness center that includes a 120,000-square-foot building as well as tennis courts, pools, whirlpool, and a parking lot on a 17.41-acre site located in the City. A detailed description of the project is contained in Chapter 2, Project Description.

3.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

This summary chapter provides an overview of the technical analysis contained in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis. This summary also includes discussions of: (a) effects found to be less than significant, (b) comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), (c) potential areas of controversy, (d) significant and unavoidable impacts and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce identified significant impacts, and (e) alternatives to the proposed project.

3.3 EFFECTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Due to certain aspects of the project, project characteristics, or existing regulatory requirements, the project is not anticipated to have significant impacts on agricultural and forest resources, population or housing or geology, soils and mineral resources. The following provides an overview of why the effects associated with these issue areas were found to be less than significant and therefore not further analyzed in this Draft EIR.

Agricultural and Forest Resources

The most recent California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Maps for Placer County designates the site as Urban and Built Up land (DOC 2010). This site has not been used for any type of agricultural activity for over 15 years and does not contain soils that meet the definition of Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site does not contain any protected farmland; therefore, potential impacts associated with the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural are considered less than significant. The SSP EIR also addressed the loss of agricultural land within the SSP area and concluded that the impact was less than significant (City of Roseville 1998).

The project site is located in an urban area and does not contain any trees or forest resources that could be impacted by future development.

Population and Housing

The proposed project includes the development of a fitness center that would employ approximately 230 part-time and 75 full-time employees. Given high regional unemployment numbers in recent years, these positions should be filled by people who already reside in the region. The project is not large enough to induce substantial population growth resulting in the need to construct new homes and provide new services for this new population. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth because it proposes no significant employment generating uses, other than staffing required for the proposed fitness center. It would not indirectly induce population growth because it would not extend roads or infrastructure into previously undeveloped areas. In addition, the project would not displace people or housing because the site is undeveloped and does not provide housing. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact on population and housing and is not further addressed.

Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources

The project site is located in Placer County and according to the California Department of Mines and Geology the South Placer area is classified as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction.

The project site is generally flat and does not contain any slopes steep enough to present a landslide hazard during construction or operation of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement.

The *City of Roseville General Plan 2025* does not identify the project site as being located in a sensitive geologic area that could expose people to potential geologic impacts. Grading activities associated with project construction would result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). The project site has been disturbed by previous grading activities and there are no notable topographic features on the site. Any grading activities would be limited to the project site and all grading and improvement plans would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department, Engineering Division, for consistency with the City's Improvement Standards. Grading activities would require a grading permit from the Engineering Division which requires including the provision of proper drainage and appropriate dust control and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures would be incorporated into the required grading plans. Additionally, project construction is subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards (section 11, Grading, page 10 and Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance), which requires preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution

Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would identify measures taken to prevent sedimentation and erosion during project construction. Due to the limited amount of soil removal and exposure of soils that is anticipated and the need to comply with the requirements of the City's Construction Standards and the federal NPDES requirements, the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is considered less than significant. Moreover, the City's Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance functions as uniformly applied development standards within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, which applies to projects, such as this one, that are consistent with a local General Plan for which an EIR has been certified. Thus, potential impacts to topsoil from erosion are exempt from CEQA under Section 15183.

The City's Public Works Department, Engineering Division, requires preparation of a geotechnical report to address suitability of the site to support buildings and to recommend measures to reduce risk of soil instability or ground failure. The City of Roseville Building Department would review construction plans before a building permit is issued and the Engineering Division would review and approve all rough grading plans to insure that all grading and proposed structures would withstand potential shrink-swell and earthquake activity in this area. Therefore, impacts associated with geology and soils are considered less than significant and not further addressed.

The project site is not identified by the City as a site containing locally important mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources. The project does not propose to excavate the site for mineral resources; therefore, no impacts related to mineral resources would result from construction of the project and are not further addressed.

3.4 COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP

During the NOP comment period, three comment letters were received. Comments were received from Caltrans, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and from the law firm Rutan & Tucker LLP. All of the comments raised in the NOP comment letters are addressed in the technical sections contained in Chapter 4. A summary of the comments received are included below.

Caltrans

Caltrans expressed concern, based on the project location, about the potential for significant impacts to Interstate 80 (I-80) resulting from an intensification of traffic-generating development. Caltrans also provided the scenarios to be analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed project, should it be determined that preparation of a Traffic Impact Study is necessary.

Regional Water Quality Control Board

The RWQCB provided an overview of the various regulations pertaining to surface water and groundwater quality.

Rutan & Tucker, LLP

The comment letter from Rutan & Tucker LLP, filed on behalf of unnamed "interested Roseville property owners," expressed concerns regarding the adequacy of the information contained in the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study. Specific concerns included a desire to see more detail included in the Initial Study project description that provides more information on various proposed uses. The comment letter also expressed a concern that the Initial Study does not provide an adequate description of the environmental setting and does not evaluate consistency with existing land use regulations and zoning or discusses potential mitigation measures. In addition, a concern was raised that the scope of the EIR should address possible physical changes in the neighborhood caused by economic or social effects of the project. The letter also raised a concern that potential impacts to water supply, wastewater and solid waste are not adequately addressed, and the analysis of storm water flows is not adequate. The commentor also raised concerns associated with traffic and parking and the need for more information to be provided to address the aesthetic effects of the project. Lastly, the commentor expressed a concern that the scope of the EIR is too narrowly focused.

3.5 POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The potential areas of controversy raised by local residents include concerns regarding an increase in traffic along area roadways, need for adequate parking, and an increase in noise associated with the proximity of the tennis courts and the outdoor pool to residences. Other potential areas of controversy include the potential for lighting to disturb adjacent residents and the change in visual character. One of the major concerns identified by Rutan and Tucker on behalf of their unspecified clients – that the Initial Study focused out too many issues – has been addressed by the expansion of the topics addressed in full in this EIR to include Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Public Services (fire, police, and parks/recreation), and Utilities (water, wastewater, and landfill capacity). All of these concerns are addressed in the technical sections included in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR.

3.6 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified for the project.

3.7 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where significant environmental impacts will not occur.

As is evident from the text of the EIR, all significant effects of the Project would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There are no impacts that remain as significant and unavoidable and which cannot be substantially lessened.

The EIR evaluates the following alternatives to the proposed project:

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative, which assumes no development would occur and the site would remain in its current undeveloped condition.

Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative. This alternative assumes development would be consistent with currently allowable land uses, zoning, and maximum development intensities. For the purposes of this EIR, development of a commercial use of up to 190,000 square feet was assumed, consistent with the SSP.

Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint Alternative. This alternative assumes development of a smaller project that includes development of an 85,000-square-foot building and does not include an indoor leisure pool, gymnasium, basketball courts, or outdoor tennis courts.

Alternative 4: Reduced Footprint/Reduced Intensity Alternative. This alternative assumes development of a 50,000-square-foot building and does not include an indoor leisure pool, gymnasium, basketball courts, or outdoor tennis courts.

3.8 SUMMARY TABLE

Information in Table 3-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, has been organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4. The summary table is arranged in four columns and organized as follows:

1. Environmental impacts;
2. Level of significance prior to mitigation;
3. Applicable mitigation; and
4. The level of significance after implementation of mitigation.

Following Table 3-1 is information on impacts associated with the project alternatives evaluated. Table 3-2 shows the severity of the impacts as compared to the proposed project.

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics			
4.1-1 Degradation of the Visual Character of the Project Site	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-2 Introduction of Uses That Are Visually Incompatible with Existing or Planned Uses in the Area	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-3 Introduction of New Sources of Light and Glare	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-4 Contribution to Cumulative Changes in the Existing Visual Character	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-5 Contribution to a Cumulative Increase in Light and Glare	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.2 Air Quality			
4.2-1 Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.2-2 Violate the Placer County Air Pollution Control District Standards for Air Quality	Potentially Significant	4.2-2(a) Prior to approval of any grading or improvement plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the City Engineer for approval demonstrating that heavy-duty (greater than 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction of the project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, shall achieve a project-wide fleet-average of 20% of NO_x reduction as compared to CARB statewide fleet average emissions. 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. The Construction Emissions Mitigation calculator (available at *www.airquality.org/ceqa/ConstructionEmissionsMitigationCalculator_v6_2012Jan.xls*) shall be used to calculate compliance with this mitigation measure.	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.2-3 Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollution Concentrations	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.2-4 Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.2-5 Result in the Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants	Potentially Significant	4.2-5(a) Prior to final map approval, the project applicant shall provide calculations to the City Engineer showing that the project would accomplish the following: Exceed Title 24 by 10%; Apply a water conservation strategy that would result in a 44.19% reduction in total water usage.	Less than Significant
		4.2-5(b) During project operations, the project operator shall ensure that only low volatile organic compound cleaning products are used on site, subject to inspection by the City.	
		4.2-5(c) Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall pay its air quality fair-share off-site mitigation fee sufficient to reduce the project's reactive organic gas and NO_x (nitrogen oxide gas)operational emissions to 10 pounds per day (estimated to be approximately $98,893),[1] for the review and approval of the PCAPCD and the City of Roseville Planning Department. Or Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall develop and propose an off-site mitigation project (equivalent to the emission reductions required for the proposed project to meet PCAPCD thresholds of significance), subject to review and approval by the City of Roseville Planning Department after consultation with the PCAPCD. The applicant must provide proof that the off-site mitigation project would reduce emissions at an equivalent amount as would be required of the proposed project.	

[1] The off-site mitigation fee for cumulative reactive organic gas and NO_x (nitrogen oxide gas) emissions was determined using the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's fee calculation spreadsheet, which is based on yearly project emissions in excess of the district's cumulative thresholds. Please refer to Appendix C of the *Air Quality Impact and Greenhouse Gas Analysis* technical report (Appendix C of this Draft EIR) for detailed calculations.

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.3 Biological Resources			
4.3-1 Substantial Adverse Effect on Species Identified As A Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status	Potentially Significant	4.3-1 Preconstruction Survey. If project construction work is required to be scheduled during the breeding season (March through August), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of the work area to determine if any native birds, including raptors, are nesting in or in the vicinity of vegetation to be removed. The preconstruction survey will be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found in the work area, the biologist shall determine an appropriately sized buffer around the nest based on the nesting species and its sensitivity to disturbance in which no work shall be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer shall be determined by City staff based on input from the biologist (using information provided in existing regulations and in guidance documents, e.g., CDFW Handbook for Swainson's Hawks and Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation), and if necessary in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).	Less than Significant
4.3-2 Substantial Adverse Effect on Riparian Habitat, Sensitive Natural Community, Wetlands	No Impact	None required.	No Impact.
4.3-3 Interfere Substantially with Wildlife Movement or Native Wildlife Nursery Sites	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.3-4 Conflict with Any Local Polices or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	No Impact	None required.	No Impact.
4.3-5 Contribute to a Cumulative Impact on Biological Resources	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.4 Climate Change			
4.4-1 Generate a Substantial Contribution to GHG Emissions That Conflict With an Applicable Plan or Policy	Potentially Significant	4.4-1 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-5 (a) through (c).	Less than Significant
4.5 Cultural Resources			
4.5-1 Disturb, Damage or Destroy Unidentified Subsurface Archaeological or Historical Resources or Human Remains during Project Construction	Potentially Significant	4.5-1(a) Proper Handling of Archaeological Resources. If any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains are encountered during any construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the project applicant shall immediately notify the City of Roseville Community Development Director and coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist as needed to assess the resources (i.e., whether it is a "historical resource" or a "unique archaeological resource") and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant. Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects, data recovery excavations. In consultation with the archaeologists, the contractor shall implement any measures deemed by City staff to be necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources. 4.5-1(b) Pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.	Less than Significant
4.5-2 Disturb Unknown Paleontological Resources during Site Preparation	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.5-3 Contribute to the Cumulative Loss of Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant	4.5-1(a) Proper Handling of Archaeological Resources. If any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains are encountered during any construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the project applicant shall immediately notify the City of Roseville Community Development Director and coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist as needed to assess the resources (i.e., whether it is a "historical resource" or a "unique archaeological resource") and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant. Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects, data recovery excavations. In consultation with the archaeologists, the contractor shall implement any measures deemed by City staff to be necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources. 4.5-1(b) Pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.	Less than Significant
4.6 Land Use			
4.6-1 Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.6-2 Compatibility with Adjacent Uses	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7 Hazards			
4.7-1 Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.7-2 Use, Storage, and Handling of Hazardous Materials within 0.25 Mile of an Existing or Proposed School	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7-3 Cumulative Exposure to Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.8-1 Change the Rate of Stormwater Runoff Through Development of New Impervious Surface Area	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-2 Degrade Surface Water Quality Due to Construction and/or Operational Activities or Violate Any Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-3 Cumulative Increase in Stormwater Flows and Flooding	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-4 Cumulative Decrease in Water Quality Associated with Project Construction and Operation	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9 Noise			
4.9-1 Substantial Temporary (Construction) Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.9-2 Increase Noise Levels in Excess of the City's General Plan or A Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-3 Increase in Noise Levels in Excess of the City's General Plan Under 2025 Conditions	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10 Public Services			
4.10-1 Increase Demand for Police Protection Services	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10-2 Increased Demand for Fire Protection Services and Emergency Access	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10-3 Increased Demand for Park Facilities	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10-4 Contribute to a Cumulative Impact on the Demand for Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and/or Parks/Recreation Services	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11 Public Utilities			
4.11-1 Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Project Demand in Wet/Dry Years	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-2 Construct or Expand Water Treatment, Conveyance, and/or Storage Facilities to Accommodate the Project	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.11-3 Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-4 Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Collection Facilities	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-5 Capacity at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to Serve the Project	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-6 Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-7 Capacity for Solid Waste Disposal at the MRF or WRSL	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-8 Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-9 Cumulative Increase in Demand for Water Supply and Treatment Capacity	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-10 Cumulative Increase in Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Plant Capacity	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.11-11 Cumulative Increase in Solid Waste	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.12 Transportation and Circulation			
4.12-1 Change in LOS at the East Roseville Parkway/ Secret Ravine Parkway Intersection	Significant	4.12-1(a) Vehicle Storage: The amount of vehicle storage in the eastbound left-turn shall be extended lanes by approximately 100 feet. This can be accomplished by extending the dual left-turn lanes an additional 30 feet using available pavement and modifying the 120-foot transition taper to a 90-foot taper. This configuration would not affect storage for the adjacent westbound left-turn lane into the Palisades Shopping Center.	Less than Significant
		4.12-1(b) Overlap Phase: An overlap phase on the southbound right-turn movement from Secret Ravine Parkway onto East Roseville Parkway shall be installed. This would require eastbound u-turns be prohibited.	
		4.12-1(c) Reduce Light Timing: The maximum green split (including yellow, and all-red intervals) shall be reduced for the southbound left-turn movement from Secret Ravine Parkway onto East Roseville Parkway from 22 to 18 seconds, and reallocate this available green time equally to the eastbound left-turn and westbound through movements. This can be accomplished by City staff from its Traffic Management Center (TMC) at City offices or through field-controller adjustments.	
		4.12-1(d) Signal Timing: The traffic signal at the East Roseville Parkway/North Sunrise Avenue intersection shall be retimed to better facilitate westbound traffic signal progression. This mitigation consists of reducing the maximum green split by 1 second for the northbound through, 2 seconds for the eastbound left, and 3 seconds for the southbound through. The green time would instead be allocated to westbound through (3 seconds added), northbound left (2 seconds added), and eastbound through (1 second added).	
4.12-2 Change in LOS at the North Sunrise Avenue/ Lead Hill Road Intersection	Significant	4.12-2 Retime Signal: The maximum green split (including yellow, and all-red) shall be reduced for the northbound through phase from 50 to 45 seconds, and the westbound left-turn maximum green split increased from 15 to 20 seconds. This can be accomplished by City staff from its Traffic Management Center (TMC) at City offices or through field-controller adjustments.	Less than Significant
4.12-3 Change in Operation of Caltrans Facilities	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-4 Impacts to Bicycle Facilities or Network	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant

Table 3-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.12-5 Impacts to Pedestrian Access	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-6 Increased Demand for Transit	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-7 Decrease in LOS at City Intersections Under 2025 Conditions	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-8 Increase in Signalized Intersections to Fall Below 70% Under 2025 Conditions	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-9 Decrease in LOS on Caltrans Facilities Under 2025 Conditions	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant
4.12-10 Add Traffic to Freeway Off-Ramps Under 2025 Conditions	Less than Significant	No mitigation required	Less than Significant

Table 3-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Density	Alternative 4: Reduced Density/Reduced Intensity
Aesthetics					
4.1-1: Alteration of the Visual Character of the Project Site	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.1-2: Introduction of Uses That Are Visually Incompatible with Existing or Planned Uses in the Area	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.1-3: Introduction of New Sources of Light and Glare	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.1-4: Contribution to Cumulative Changes in the Existing Visual Character	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.1-5: Contribution to a Cumulative Increase in Light and Glare	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
Air Quality					
4.2-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-2: Violate the Placer County Air Pollution Control District standards for air quality	LS/M (construction)	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollution Concentrations	LS	NI	LS/M+	LS	LS
4.2-4: Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-5: Result in the Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants	LS/M	NI	LS	LS	LS
Biological Resources					
4.3-1: Substantial Adverse Effect on Species Identified As A Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.3-2: Substantial Adverse Effect on Riparian Habitat, Sensitive Natural Community, Wetlands	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.3-3: Interfere Substantially with Wildlife Movement or Native Wildlife Nursery Sites	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.3-4: Conflict with Any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.3-5: Contribute to a Cumulative Impact on Biological Resources	LS	NI	NI	NI	NI

Table 3-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Density	Alternative 4: Reduced Density/Reduced Intensity
Climate Change					
4.4-1: Generate a Substantial Contribution to Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions That Conflict With an Applicable Plan or Policy	LS/M	NI	LS/M+	LS/M	LS/M
Cultural Resources					
4.5-1: Disturb, Damage or Destroy Unidentified Subsurface Archaeological or Historical Resources or Human Remains during Project Construction	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.5-2: Disturb Unknown Paleontological Resources During Site Preparation	LS	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.5-3: Contribute to the Cumulative Loss of Cultural Resources	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
Land Use and Planning					
4.6-1: Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Uses	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
4.7-1: Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.7-2: Use, Storage, and Handling of Hazardous Materials within 0.25 Mile of an Existing or Proposed School	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.7-3: Cumulative Exposure to Hazardous Materials	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
Hydrology and Water Quality					
4.8-1: Change in the Rate of Stormwater Runoff through the Development of New Impervious Surface Area	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.8-2: Degrade Surface Water Quality due to Construction and/or Operational Activities or Violate any Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.8-3: Cumulative Increase in Stormwater Flows and Flooding	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.8-4: Cumulative Decrease in Water Quality Associated with Project Construction and Operation	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS

Table 3-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Density	Alternative 4: Reduced Density/Reduced Intensity
Noise					
4.9-1: Substantial Temporary (Construction) Increase in Ambient Noise Levels Greater Than 3 dBA (A-weighted decibels)	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.9-2: Increase Noise Levels in Excess of the City's General Plan or A Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels Greater than 3 dBA	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.9-3: Increase in noise levels in excess of the City's General Plan under 2025 conditions	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
Public Services					
4.10-1: Increased Demand for Police Protection Services	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.10-2: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Services and Emergency Access	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.10-3: Increased Demand for Park Facilities	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.10-4: Contribute to a Cumulative Impact on the Demand for Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and/or Parks/Recreation Services	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
Public Utilities					
4.11-1: Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Project Demand in Wet/Dry Years	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.11-2: Construct or Expand Water Treatment, Conveyance, and/or Storage Facilities to Accommodate the Project	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.11-3: Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.11-4: Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Collection or Treatment Facilities	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.11-5: Capacity at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to Serve the Project	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.11-6: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-

Table 3-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Reduced Density	Alternative 4: Reduced Density/Reduced Intensity
4.11-7: Capacity for Solid Waste Disposal at the Materials Recovery Facility or Western Regional Sanitary Landfill	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS-
4.11-8: Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.11-9: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Water Supply and Treatment Capacity	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS
4.11-10: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Plant Capacity	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS
4.11-11: Cumulative Increase in Solid Waste	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS
Transportation and Circulation					
4.12-1: Change in LOS at the East Roseville Parkway/Secret Ravine Parkway intersection	LS/M	NI	LS/M+	LS/M	LS/M
4.12-2: Change in LOS at the North Sunrise Avenue/Lead Hill Road intersection	LS/M	NI	LS/M+	LS/M	LS/M
4.12-3: Change in Operation of Caltrans Facilities	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.12-4: Impacts to Bicycle Facilities or Network	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.12-5: Impacts to Pedestrian Access	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.12-6: Increased Demand for Transit	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.12-7: Decrease in LOS at City Intersections under 2025 Conditions	LS	NI	PS	LS	LS
4.12-8: Increase in Signalized Intersections to Fall below 70% under 2025 Conditions	LS	NI	PS	LS	LS
4.12-9: Decrease in LOS on Caltrans Facilities under 2025 Conditions	LS	NI	PS	LS	LS
4.12-10: Add Traffic to Freeway Off-Ramps under 2025 Conditions	LS	NI	PS	LS	LS

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK