

## **SECTION 4.11 PUBLIC UTILITIES**

### **4.11.1 Introduction**

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates potential impacts associated with demand for water supply, wastewater treatment, and landfill capacity associated with implementation of the Life Time Fitness Project (proposed project). The analysis of water supply, including the environmental and regulatory setting and impact discussion, is followed by the analysis of wastewater and landfill capacity. The cumulative impact analysis is included at the end of this section.

Information contained in this section is based on information provided in City documents and a review of existing documentation, including the following:

- *City of Roseville General Plan*, as amended February 2013 (City of Roseville 2013a)
- *Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines* (City of Roseville 2007)
- *Stoneridge Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Roseville 1998)
- *Creekview Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report* (City of Roseville 2010).

These documents are available for review by members of the public during normal business hours (Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.) at the City of Roseville Permit Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California 95678.

One comment letter in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) expressed a concern that water demand associated with the various project elements needs to be evaluated. This section includes an evaluation of the project's water demand as well as wastewater treatment capacity and landfill life span. Please see Appendix A for a copy of the comments received in response to the NOP.

### **4.11.2 Environmental Setting – Water Supply**

#### **Water Supply**

The City of Roseville (City) would serve as the water supplier for the proposed project. The City's water supply sources include surface water from Folsom Lake, groundwater, and recycled water for landscape irrigation. The City's source for water has historically been from Folsom Lake (since 1971). Groundwater is occasionally used as backup supply. Recycled water is available for landscape irrigation from both the Dry Creek and the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants. Each of the City's water supply sources is described below.

In addition to the water supplies identified above, supplemental water is available from other agencies through system interties. These water system interties are typically operated during treatment plant disruptions, such as are occasionally experienced during plant construction projects or other maintenance operations that require treatment plant or pump station shutdown. Water system interties are also used for equal trading of water supplies in two different service areas due to local operational needs.

### **Surface Water Supply**

The City's current surface water supply is American River water diverted from Folsom Lake. Folsom Lake has been the primary source of water supply to the City since 1971. Prior to 1971, the City relied on Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) water delivered through the Boardman Canal to a treatment facility that was located in the eastern portion of the City, which is now a part of the Stoneridge Specific Plan (SSP) area. Additionally, prior to 1971, the City also used groundwater from wells located in the older part of the City.

Surface water is now delivered from Folsom Lake via United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) facilities through a pumping plant and parallel 48-inch and 60-inch transmission lines to the City's water treatment plant, located on Barton Road in Granite Bay. The City's water plant has a treatment capacity of 100 million gallons per day (mgd). Water is treated through conventional treatment processes of flocculation/sedimentation, filtration, and disinfection. Treated water is fluoridated for consumer health, and pH is adjusted for corrosion protection of the distribution system.

The City has contracts for 66,000 acre-feet per year of surface water through contracts with the USBR, PCWA, and San Juan Water District (SJWD). The City maintains a contract entitlement with the USBR for 32,000 acre-feet of Central Valley Project supplies. Roseville's water supply contract with PCWA allows for 30,000 acre-feet of American River Middle Fork Project water wheeled through USBR facilities at Folsom Lake. Lastly, the City has a current contract with SJWD for 4,000 acre-feet. The SJWD supply is a normal or wet year supply and is served from part of SJWD's contract with PCWA for 25,000 acre-feet of Middle Fork Project water, also served from Folsom Lake.

The City participated in the Water Forum, a regional stakeholder effort concerned with the protection of the Lower American River and reliable water supplies. The Water Forum resulted in the development of purveyor-specific agreements that outline how suppliers will meet commitments agreed to as part of the Water Forum efforts. The goal of the Water Forum was to provide a safe and reliable water supply through the year 2030, while protecting resources associated with the Lower American River. Roseville's agreement included a limitation of diversion from the American River in both wet and dry years. In wet years the City agreed to

limit diversions from its American River supply contracts to no more than 54,900 acre-feet in normal/wet years, and no less than 39,800 acre-feet in driest years (critically dry). Through its agreement with SJWD, the City increased its normal year water supplies by an additional 4,000 acre-feet, for a total normal/wet year supply of 58,900 acre-feet. These water supply contracts and Water Forum limitations are summarized in Table 4.10-1 and further described within the City’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP; City of Roseville 2011).

**Table 4.11-1  
City of Roseville Surface Water Contracts**

| Contracted Water Supply Source                               | Contract Amount (AFY) |
|--|-----------------------|
| USBR   | 32,000                |
| PCWA   | 30,000                |
| SJWD (normal/wet year only)                                  | 4,000                 |
| Total Contracted Supplies                                    | 66,000                |
| Available Supplies: Normal/Wet Years <sup>1</sup>            | 58,900                |
| Available Supplies: Driest/Critically Dry Years <sup>1</sup> | 39,800                |

Source: City of Roseville 2010.

Note:

<sup>1</sup> As a result of City commitments made under the Water Forum.

Although water contract entitlements total 66,000 acre-feet, the City’s diversions from the American River are limited by the Water Forum Agreement (WFA; Water Forum 2000). The Water Forum categorized water years into three types: (1) Normal or Wet Years (normal/wet), (2) Drier Years, and (3) Driest Years (critically dry). These hydrologic year types are defined as follows:

- Normal or Wet Years: When the projected March through November American River Unimpaired Inflow to Folsom Reservoir is greater than 950,000 acre-feet;
- Drier Years: When the projected March through November American River Unimpaired Inflow to Folsom Reservoir is between 950,000 and 400,000 acre-feet; and
- Driest (Critically Dry) Years: When the projected March through November American River Unimpaired Inflow to Folsom Reservoir is less than 400,000 acre-feet.

In normal/wet years, the City is limited to 58,900 acre-feet, while in driest (critically dry) years, the maximum diversion from the American River is limited to 39,800 acre-feet. In drier (below average) years, the City may divert an amount between 58,900 and 39,800 acre-feet from the American River based on the WFA.

### **4.11.3 Regulatory Setting**

#### **Federal Regulations**

Folsom Dam on the American River, from which the City of Roseville draws its surface water supplies, is managed by the USBR as part of the Central Valley Project. Numerous laws, directives, opinions, and orders affect or otherwise have influence on the management of the Central Valley Project.

#### **State Regulations**

##### ***Senate Bills 610 and 221***

In 2001, the California Legislature enacted two pieces of legislation relevant to environmental review focused on the water consumption associated with large development projects. Senate Bill (SB) 610 (Chapter 643, Statutes of 2001; Section 21151.9 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 10910 et seq. of the Water Code) requires the preparation of water supply assessments (WSAs) for large developments (i.e., more than 500 dwelling units or nonresidential equivalent). Government Code section 66473.7(a)(1) requires an affirmative written verification of sufficient water supply. Senate Bill 221 is designed as a “fail-safe” mechanism to ensure that collaboration on finding the needed water supplies to serve a new large subdivision occurs early in the planning process. The project is not large enough to require preparation of a WSA pursuant to SB 610 or a water supply verification pursuant to SB 221.

##### ***Urban Water Management Planning Act***

The Urban Water Management Planning Act was established in Division 6, Part 2.6 of the California Water Code. The act was developed due to concerns for potential water supply shortages throughout the State of California. It requires information on water supply reliability and water use efficiency measures. Urban water suppliers are required as part of the act to develop and implement UWMPs to describe their efforts to promote efficient use and management of water resources. The City has complied with the Urban Water Management Planning Act through the adoption of the City’s UWMP, which is described in the following Local Regulations discussion.

##### ***SB 1938 and AB 3030***

In September 2002, the Legislature enacted, and the Governor signed, SB 1938, which amended then-existing law related to groundwater management by local agencies. The law requires any public agency seeking State funds administered through the DWR for the construction of groundwater projects or groundwater quality projects to prepare and implement a groundwater

management plan with certain specified components. Prior to this new statute, there were no required plan components. Requirements include establishing basin management objectives, preparing a plan to involve other local agencies in a cooperative planning effort, and adopting monitoring protocols that promote efficient and effective groundwater management.

Assembly Bill 3030, the Groundwater Management Act (Sections 10750–10756 of the California Water Code), provides a systematic procedure for an existing local agency to voluntarily develop a groundwater management plan (GWMP). AB 3030 enables water agencies to develop and implement GWMPs to manage the groundwater resources in the jurisdiction of the participating parties. The state does not maintain a statewide program or mandate its implementation, but the legislation provides the guidelines and common framework through which groundwater management can be implemented.

### ***Senate Bill X7 7***

In November 2009, after an extraordinary session, the Legislature enacted, and the Governor signed, Senate Bill X7 7, which created a statewide goal of achieving a 20 percent reduction in urban per capita water use in California by 2020. Under this statute, urban water suppliers are required to establish water conservation targets for the years 2015 and 2020.

## **Local Regulations**

### ***Water Forum Agreement***

The WFA is the result of the efforts of a diverse group of community stakeholders. The stakeholder group was formed in 1994 with the goal to formulate principles for developing solutions to meet future regional water supply needs. Participants in the Water Forum have developed two coequal objectives:

- Provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region’s economic health and planned development to the year 2030.
- Preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Lower American River.

Water Forum stakeholders have developed an integrated package of actions that will meet these two coequal objectives. Each element of the package is necessary for a regional solution to work. These elements are as follows:

- Increases surface water divisions
- Actions to meet customers’ needs while reducing diversion impacts on the Lower American River in drier years

- An improved pattern of fishery flow releases from Folsom Reservoir
- Lower American River Habitat Management Program, which also addresses recreation in the Lower American River
- Water conservation
- Groundwater management
- Water Forum successor efforts (Water Forum 2000).

Purveyor-Specific Agreements have also been developed that describe in detail how each of the elements will be implemented by the respective purveyors. Purveyors included the City of Roseville, the Placer County Water Agency, and the San Juan Water District, as well as other regional water agencies. The Purveyor-Specific Agreements are compiled into a Memorandum of Understanding that each stockholder's authorizing body has executed. In return for signing the final WFA, water purveyors receive regional support for water supply projects, including site-specific infrastructure development.

#### ***City of Roseville Groundwater Management Plan***

In August 2007, the City, in participation with the PCWA and the City of Lincoln, completed a groundwater management plan compliant with both SB 1938 and AB 3030.

#### ***City of Roseville Municipal Code***

Section 14 of the City's Municipal Code (City of Roseville 2013b) contains regulations associated with water rates (Chapter 14.08), water conservation (Chapter 14.09), and installation of water facilities (Chapter 14.08).

#### ***City of Roseville General Plan***

The City of Roseville General Plan contains goals and policies relating to water supply and distribution. Goals and policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below:

- Goal 1**      Maintain a water system that adequately serves the existing community and planned growth levels, ensuring the ability to meet projected water demand and to provide needed improvements, repairs and replacements in a timely manner.
- Goal 2**      Provide water services to all existing and future Roseville water utility customers. The provision of services by another provider may be considered where it is determined that such service is beneficial to the City and its utility customers or the provisions of City services is not feasible.

- Goal 4** Actively pursue water conservation measures.
- Policy 1:** Secure sufficient sources of water to meet the needs of the existing community and planned growth.
- Policy 5:** Ensure all development provides for and pays a fair share of the cost for adequate water distribution, including line extensions, easements, and plant expansions.
- Policy 10:** Develop and implement water conservation standards and measures as necessary elements of the water system (City of Roseville 2013a).

#### ***City of Roseville Urban Water Management Plan***

The City prepared and adopted a *2010 Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP; City of Roseville 2011). This plan was prepared to comply with the Urban Water Management Planning Act of the California Water Code (described under State Regulations). UWMPs must be developed by urban water providers supplying more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, and submitted to the California DWR every 5 years. The UWMP describes the availability of water and discusses water use, recycled water use, and water conservation.

#### ***City of Roseville Water Conservation Ordinance***

In 1991, the City developed and adopted the Roseville Water Conservation and Drought Mitigation Ordinance as documented in the City’s Municipal Code Chapter 14.09 (City of Roseville 2013b). Under this ordinance, the City has authority to declare water shortage conditions and implement drought-related mitigation measures.

In February 2008, the City of Roseville adopted Ordinance 4629, which added Sections 14.09.200–14.09.220 and amended Sections 14.09-020–14.09.090 of the Roseville Municipal Code regarding water conservation. The purpose of this ordinance is to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local requirements relating to water conservation and drought mitigation. Ordinance 4629 provides an approach to conservation that reflects that there are now more water customers billed on metered rates, which creates additional tools to achieve conservation.

#### ***City of Roseville Landscaping Ordinance***

In 2006, the State enacted legislation requiring the DWR to update the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The updated model ordinance contains several new landscape and irrigation design requirements aimed at reducing water waste in landscape irrigation. All local land use agencies are required to adopt the model ordinance or develop an ordinance that is at least as effective by January 2010. The City of Roseville adopted an

ordinance tailored to meet the City's needs that is based on, and is at least as effective as, the model ordinance. The new Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (WELO) has been incorporated into the City's Zoning Ordinance as Chapter 19.67 and supersedes the City's 1993 Water Efficient Landscape Requirements document. The City amended the WELO in May 2013 to clarify language and provide consistency with state Green Building Code.

### *City of Roseville 2013 Design/Construction Standards*

Section 8 of the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards, Water System Design (City of Roseville 2013c), provides criteria for the design of domestic water systems. Compliance with these standards ensures that water delivery facilities are properly sized to distribute water to any new customers that would be created as a result of implementing the proposed project.

#### **4.11.4 Impacts**

The potable water demand created by the project is compared against the City's water supply portfolio and its ability to obtain water from the American River in normal/wet year conditions. The project site is located within the SSP area and has been assumed for commercial development since the SSP was adopted in 1998. The SSP EIR analyzed the availability of water supplies to serve buildout of the specific plan and determined adequate water supplies were available at that time. The SSP assumed a water demand rate for commercial uses of 2,678 gallons per day (gpd)/acre which would account for a water demand of 46,597 gpd or 52.20 acre-feet per year (AFY). The demand for potable water has been factored into the City's long-range plans to serve development of this site. The City has indicated that adequate water supplies are available to serve the project, as described below.

Using the City's current demand factor of 2,598 gpd/acre for commercial use and assuming development of the entire 17.41-acre site, the project would generate a water demand of 45,205 gpd or 50.64 AFY, which is less than what was previously assumed in the SSP EIR. Detailed information on the City's water supply and water demands are documented in the City's most recent WSA, prepared for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Westbrook Amendment, dated March 2012 (City of Roseville 2012<http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=23269>). Information from Sierra Vista Specific Plan WSA is relevant to this project because it provides the most current information on the status of the City's water supply and water demands. This document is also available for review by members of the public during normal business hours (Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.) at the City of Roseville Permit Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California 95678.

### Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the City’s General Plan, and professional judgment, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would do the following:

- Result in insufficient water supplies to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, such that new or expanded water supplies are required;
- Result in or require the construction or expansion of water treatment, conveyance, and/ or storage facilities that would create significant environmental effects; or
- Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or substantial lowering of the local groundwater table.

| Impact 4.11-1                              | Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Project Demand in Wet/Dry Years  |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan Policies<br>Urban Water Management Plan<br>City of Roseville Water Conservation Ordinance<br>Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant   |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required   |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant   |

Development of the proposed project would require water for the bistro and café, locker rooms/showers, pools, water slide, and exterior landscaping. Using the City’s demand rate of 2,598 gpd/acre for Community Commercial/Retail, it is assumed that this factor conservatively captures the water demand of all the proposed uses because it assumes the entire site would be developed and would require water, when approximately 57% of the site would be developed with tennis courts and parking which would not generate an increase in water demand. Using this factor, the project would generate a water demand of approximately 45,205 gpd or 50.64 AFY. As documented in the Sierra Vista WSA, City water demands at buildout are expected to reach 63,170 AFY, which includes the water demands from the proposed project. When considering the use of recycled water to offset irrigation demands at buildout of 4,329 AFY surface water demand needs are 58,841 AFY, which is below the City’s American River diversion limitations of 58,900 AFY per the Water Forum Agreement.

The water demand rate for Community Commercial uses in the SSP Draft EIR assumed a rate of 2,678 gpd (City of Roseville 1998), which is higher than the City’s current demand factor for this

use. In addition, the project is designed to comply with the City’s Water Conservation Ordinance and Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance, which would help conserve water and reduce water demands. The City has determined that existing water supplies are sufficient to serve this project in normal/wet and in dry and critically dry years. A letter has been issued by the City of Roseville dated November 7, 2012, indicating that the City has adequate water and wastewater capacities available to serve the proposed project.

Therefore, adequate water supplies are available to serve the project, and the impact is considered **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-2                              | Construct or Expand Water Treatment, Conveyance, and/or Storage Facilities to Accommodate the Project                    |
|--|--|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan Policies<br>Urban Water Management Plan<br>City of Roseville Water Conservation Ordinance |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant  |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required  |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant  |

The proposed project would install an on-site public “looped” 12-inch water main to serve on-site domestic and fire safety water demands, per the City’s requirements. The public looped water main points of connection would come from an existing 12-inch water line extended on site from East Roseville Parkway, and from a 12-inch line stubbed off of Secret Ravine Parkway. The main water line in East Roseville Parkway consists of a 16-inch water transmission pipe with a 24-inch transmission line in Secret Ravine Parkway.

In addition to the proposed 12-inch public looped water main, the project would also install a private on-site water system. This would consist of a 12-inch water main that loops around the building and pool area to serve fire hydrants, a 6-inch fire line for the building’s sprinkler system, a 4-inch line to provide domestic water to the building, and a 1.5-inch water line to serve the outdoor bistro. The final decision of all on-site pipe sizing would be made by the City.

Surface water is delivered and treated at the City’s Barton Road Water Treatment Plant prior to delivery to City water customers. The Barton Road Water Treatment Plant has a treatment capacity of 100 mgd and currently treats an average of 55–60 mgd and can accommodate the water demands of the project. In addition, the existing water infrastructure that serves the area has been designed to accommodate buildout of the site with commercial uses, which assumed a larger development footprint per the SSP than the proposed project, and does not need to be expanded to accommodate the project. Therefore, the project impact would be **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-3                              | Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge    |
|--|--|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan Policies<br>Urban Water Management Plan |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant  |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required  |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant  |

Groundwater supply is partly dependent on recharge by percolation of rainwater through permeable surfaces. Groundwater recharge in the project area occurs primarily along stream channels such as Dry Creek. As described in the Environmental Setting, 4.11.2, above, the project site is undeveloped and there are minimal impervious surfaces; soils that are impermeable or underlain by hardpan comprise most of the project site. In these areas, infiltration is low, thereby limiting groundwater recharge.

Although there would be new impervious surfaces created by development (building, parking lot, outdoor pool/deck, tennis courts, child activity area), recharge is already limited under existing conditions and this site is not identified by the City as being a recharge area. Runoff from new impervious surfaces would be collected and diverted through on-site drainage controls, leaving landscaped areas and grassy swales as pervious surface area. Collecting on-site surface runoff would be controlled by a series of “curb cuts” and drainage inlets. Some infiltration from these features would occur. Water from flows released from the project to downstream channels could also provide some recharge. In effect, recharge would still occur, but at different locations and at different rates than under existing conditions. The City limits the types and locations of structures that could be placed near stream channels, where groundwater recharge is the highest. Because areas along stream channels would remain undeveloped either because of proximity to the 100-year floodplain or with the use of natural resource buffers, recharge along stream channels would not be affected. Therefore, the project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact on groundwater recharge potential and would not result in a reduction in available groundwater supply.

#### 4.11.5 Mitigation Measures

None required.

### **4.11.6 Environmental Setting – Wastewater**

The City is the wastewater service provider for properties located within the City and will be the service provider for the proposed project. Wastewater is collected in sewer lines that ultimately connect to one of two regional wastewater treatment facilities. Treated wastewater is then either discharged into local area creeks in compliance with state permit requirements, or used as recycled water.

The project would be served by the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP) located on Booth Road, along Dry Creek, in the southwest portion of the City.

#### **Wastewater Service Area**

The City of Roseville, the South Placer Municipal Utility District, and Placer County are regional participants in the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA). The SPWA was created in the year 2000 to oversee policy for funding regional wastewater infrastructure. The City owns and operates two regional wastewater treatment facilities on behalf of the regional partners. These treatment facilities are the DCWWTP and the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP).

The City prepared the South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Systems Evaluation, June 2007 and updated December, 2009), which delineates the 2005 regional wastewater service area boundary (2005 SAB) and provides baseline and projected characterizations of this regional wastewater and recycled water systems. The 2005 SAB includes areas within the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Loomis and portions of Granite Bay and unincorporated Placer County. The project site is located within the 2005 SAB.

The Systems Evaluation is also the long-term planning tool to project wastewater treatment needs and to identify necessary capital improvement projects to accommodate urban growth within the 2005 SAB. The Systems Evaluation document addressed system conditions as of June 2004 and anticipated buildout conditions within the 2005 SAB. Buildout of the 2005 SAB, including rezones and intensifications, would result in 16.34 mgd average dry weather flow (ADWF) at the DCWWTP and 16.52 mgd ADWF at the PGWWTP. Under the ultimate SPWA boundary (the current 2005 Service Area plus anticipated Urban Grown Areas), the ADWF of the DCWWTP is estimated at 19.98 mgd ADWF and the PGWWTP is estimated at 25.67 mgd ADWF (Table ES-6, Systems Evaluation, December 2009).

#### **Wastewater Treatment**

Wastewater from the City of Roseville is currently treated at two regional wastewater treatment facilities. Both facilities are City owned and operated. The first plant, the

DCWWTP, is located on Booth Road, along Dry Creek, in the southwest portion of the City. The second plant, the PGWWTP, is located on the east side of Westside Drive, south of the Roseville Energy Park. Since the project would be served by the DCWWTP, information on that plant is provided below.

### **Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant**

The DCWWTP provides tertiary-level wastewater treatment through the process of screening, grit removal, primary clarification, aeration, secondary clarification, filtration, and ultraviolet disinfection. In addition, the DCWWTP provides full nitrification and de-nitrification. The current average dry weather flow (ADWF) is approximately 10 mgd, of which approximately 6 mgd comes from the City of Roseville. The peak daily wet weather flow during the last 12 months was 17 mgd. The plant is permitted to discharge up to 18 mgd ADWF into Dry Creek under an existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0079502/Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) No. R5-2008-0077 adopted on June 12, 2008 (City of Roseville 2010). The DCWWTP would serve the proposed project.

### **Wastewater Collection**

The City's wastewater collection system includes both gravity sewer lines and lift stations with associated force mains.

## **4.11.7 Regulatory Setting**

### **Federal Regulations**

#### *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (Federal and State)*

The NPDES permit system was established in the Clean Water Act to regulate municipal and industrial discharges to surface waters of the United States. The discharge of wastewater to surface waters is prohibited unless an NPDES permit has been issued to allow that discharge. Each NPDES permit includes the following provisions: effluent and receiving water limits of allowable concentrations and/or mass of pollutants contained in the discharge; prohibitions on discharges not specifically allowed under the permit; provisions that describe required actions by the discharger, including industrial pretreatment, pollution prevention, and self-monitoring activities; and other regulatory requirements.

## **State Regulations**

### ***Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act***

The Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter–Cologne Act) is California’s statutory authority for the protection of water quality. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the State must adopt water quality plans, policies, and objectives that will provide protection to the State’s waters for the use and enjoyment of the people of California. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has authority and responsibility for establishing policy for water quality control issues for the State. Regional authority for planning, permitting, and enforcement is delegated to the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The Porter–Cologne Act authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCBs to issue NPDES permits containing waste discharge requirements, and to enforce these permits. SWRCB and RWQCB regulations implementing the Porter–Cologne Act are included in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

### ***General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems***

The General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems were adopted by the SWRCB in May 2006. These WDRs require local jurisdictions to develop a sewer system management plan (SSMP) that addresses the necessary operation and emergency response plans to reduce sanitary sewer overflows. The WDRs require that the local jurisdiction approve the SSMP and the Roseville City Council approved the City’s SSMP on January 21, 2009.

## **Local Regulations**

### ***South Placer Wastewater Authority***

The SPWA is a joint powers authority formed to fund regional wastewater and recycled water facilities in southwestern Placer County for three partner agencies (the “participants”): the City of Roseville, the South Placer Municipal Utility District, and portions of Placer County. The regional facilities funded by the SPWA thus far include recycled water facilities, trunk sewer lines, and two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). All three participants transmit wastewater to these WWTPs. The SPWA also monitors compliance with operational criteria established in the funding and operations agreements among the participants.

### ***City of Roseville Municipal Code***

Section 14 of the City’s Municipal Code (City of Roseville 2013b) contains regulations associated with sewer use, sewer rates and charges, and industrial wastewater. Chapter 14.26 prohibits discharge to a sanitary sewer of any pollutant or wastewater that would interfere with the operation or performance of the City’s wastewater collection or treatment facilities.

### *City of Roseville General Plan*

The City of Roseville General Plan contains goals and policies that are designed to ensure that residents have adequate wastewater service.

**Goal 1** Participate in a cooperative regional approach to wastewater that adequately services planned growth within the city.

**Goal 4** Meet State of California and EPA water quality standards for the discharge of treated wastewater, as well as meet State of California quality standards for the production of recycled water.

**Policy 2:** Ensure adequate storm surge capacity at the wastewater treatment plants.

**Policy 4:** Ensure that wastewater treatment capacity is available and that wastewater generation is minimized (City of Roseville 2013a).

### *City of Roseville 2013 Design/Construction Standards*

Section 9 of the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards, Sanitary Sewer Design (City of Roseville 2013c), provides criteria for design of sewer systems. Compliance with these standards would reduce impacts related to wastewater conveyance by ensuring that wastewater collection and conveyance facilities are properly sized to convey the flows from development associated with the project.

## **4.11.8 Impacts**

### **Methods of Analysis**

For wastewater treatment, the demand for treatment was calculated for the project and compared to the capacity of the DCWWTP. Using the City's average dry weather flow wastewater generation rate for commercial facilities of 850 gpd/acre, and applying that factor to the project site of 17.4 acres, the project is anticipated to generate 14,790 gpd or 0.015 mgd ADWF.

The SSP EIR used a demand rate of 1,040 gpd/acre to estimate the quantity of wastewater to be treated at the DCWWTP. This rate is significantly higher than the rate the City currently uses. Similar to water (see Section 4.11.4), since the SSP was approved in 1998 the City has factored development of this site into the City's long-range plans for wastewater treatment. The DCWWTP is currently sized to accommodate treatment flow from the proposed project.

### Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the City’s General Plan, and professional judgment, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would do the following:

- Result in or require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment or collection facilities that would create significant environmental effects;
- Result in a determination that inadequate capacity is available at the wastewater treatment plant to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to existing wastewater treatment commitments; or
- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

| Impact 4.11-4                              | Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Collection Facilities |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville Improvement Standards                       |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant   |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required   |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant   |

The project site is located within the SSP area and has been assumed for commercial development since the SSP was adopted in 1998. The demand for wastewater treatment has been factored into the City’s long-range plans to provide these resources and services for planned development. There are four existing 8-inch sanitary sewer lines currently stubbed on site. The project would connect into two of the sewer line stubs. The other two remaining sewer line stubs would be capped off for potential future points of connection.

Sewer generated by the project would flow via gravity to an existing 8-inch sewer line stubbed off the existing driveway off Secret Ravine Parkway. At this point of connection, the sewer line would start as an 8-inch sewer line that would run parallel to Secret Ravine Parkway, terminating approximately 35 feet from the property boundary. At this point it would become a private sanitary sewer system heading upstream along the rear of the site. The 8-inch private sanitary sewer line would terminate at the rear of the building (near the trash enclosure), and would be downsized to a 6-inch sewer line continuing upstream to connect to the outdoor bistro. One 8-inch sewer lateral would accommodate the building’s wastewater demand along with two 4-inch sewer laterals.

The existing sewer infrastructure installed as part of the SSP was sized to accommodate future development of the project site with commercial uses. The existing infrastructure is adequate to support the project and would not require replacement or upsizing of the lines for the project.

Therefore, the proposed project would not require any upgrades or expansions to the existing wastewater conveyance infrastructure, and the impact is **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-5                              | Capacity at the DCWWTP to Serve the Project |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan              |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant                       |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required                               |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant                       |

Sewer flows generated by the project would be conveyed to the DCWWTP for treatment. The project would generate 14,790 gpd or 0.015 mgd ADWF. The current ADWF at the plant is approximately 10 mgd, of which approximately 6 mgd comes from the City of Roseville. As documented in the Systems Evaluation report, demands generated within the 2005 SAB (of which the project site is included) that flow to the DCWWTP are expected to reach 16.34 mgd ADWF. The DCWWTP is permitted to discharge up to 18 mgd ADWF into Dry Creek under an existing NPDES Permit No. CA0079502/WDR No. R5-2008-0077 adopted on June 12, 2008. Therefore, the DCWWTP has adequate capacity available to serve the project site and will not require immediate upgrades or expansions due to flow from the project.

The DCWWTP will be expanded in the future to accommodate future Urban Growth areas located within the ultimate South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) service area boundary. Because expansion needs at the DCWWTP are due to other future urban grown areas and not from the proposed project, and because the DCWWTP site is sized and has been planned for future expansion needs, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-6                              | Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board |
|--|--|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act<br>NPDES Permit                             |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant  |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required  |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant  |

The DCWWTP is permitted to discharge up to 18 mgd ADWF into Dry Creek under an existing NPDES Permit No. CA0079502/WDR No. R5-2008-0077 adopted on June 12, 2008. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCB to issue

NPDES permits containing waste discharge requirements, and to enforce these permits. Because the DCWWTP has capacity to serve the project within its existing NPDES Permit, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, and the impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### **4.11.9 Mitigation Measures**

None required.

#### **4.11.10 Environmental Setting – Solid Waste**

##### **Solid Waste Collection and Disposal**

Solid waste generated in the City of Roseville is collected and hauled by the City and delivered to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA) for processing and disposal. The WPWMA, a regional agency composed of the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln and Placer County, owns and operates the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL). The MRF and the WRSL are located on 320 acres at the southwest corner of Athens Avenue and Fiddymont Road in Placer County, and are approximately 3 miles north of the project site. Nortech Waste LLC, a private firm, operates the MRF and Nortech Landfill Inc., a private firm, operates the landfill under separate contracts to the WPWMA.

The City of Roseville has entered into a joint powers agreement with these other agencies for solid waste management. The joint powers agreement administers the County's Solid Waste Management Plan. The City entered into a flow control agreement with the WPWMA in 2005, which requires all waste generated within the City limits to be delivered to the MRF for sorting and disposal at the WRSL. In compliance with the City's Municipal Code, Section 9.17.050 (City of Roseville 2013b), all construction and demolition debris generated within the City of Roseville must be delivered to the WPWMA facilities for recycling or disposal. Collection of solid waste within the City is operated and managed by the City's Environmental Utilities Department. Permitted non-exclusive franchise haulers may handle temporary refuse collection and disposal for construction and demolition.

The majority of solid waste collected from within the service area is first delivered to the MRF for processing. The MRF, which opened in 1995, receives, separates, processes, and markets recyclable materials removed from delivered solid waste. The MRF has a mixed-waste processing capacity of 2,200 tons per day, a permitted processing capacity of 1,750 tons per day, and a permitted vehicle capacity of 1,014 vehicles per day. In addition to processing mixed solid waste, the MRF includes a green waste compost facility. The compost portion of the facility has an annual processing capacity of 82,000 tons. In 2012, the average weekday tonnage received at

the MRF was 1,064 tons. In 2012, the MRF achieved a diversion rate of over 44%. Typically, the MRF diverts 30% of recyclable material before the remaining waste is shipped to the WRS� for disposal (Placer County 2013).

The WRS� is a Class II/III municipal solid waste (non-hazardous) landfill. The WRS� is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day. In 2010 the WRS� received an average of 803 tons per weekday. The WRS� has a permitted capacity of 36,350,000 cubic yards and as of September 2012 had a remaining capacity of 25,993,222 cubic yards. Under current projected development conditions, the landfill has a projected lifespan extending through 2058.

### **4.11.11 Regulatory Setting**

#### **Federal Regulations**

##### ***Resource Conservation and Recovery Act***

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 258 (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Subtitle D, contains regulations for municipal solid waste landfills and requires states to implement their own permitting programs incorporating the federal landfill criteria. The federal regulations address the location, operation, design, groundwater monitoring, and closure of landfills.

#### **State Regulations**

##### ***California Integrated Waste Management Act***

The California Integrated Waste Management Act, also known as AB 939 (PRC, Section 41780), enacted in 1989, contains regulations affecting solid waste disposal in California. AB 939 is designed to increase landfill life and conserve other resources through increased source reduction and recycling. AB 939 requires cities and counties to prepare solid waste management plans and adopt source reduction and recycling elements (SRREs) to implement AB 939's goals. These goals include diverting approximately 50% of solid waste from landfills and identifying programs to stimulate local recycling in manufacturing and the purchase of recycled products.

The SRRE that is part of the City of Roseville General Plan contains goals and policies for solid waste disposal. The City has met AB 939's 50% reduction goal for 2000. The City's waste reduction for 2006 was 66%. To meet these goals, the SRRE specifies three methods: (1) source reduction, which is a net reduction in waste generation at the source; (2) recycling, which is a reuse of materials to produce new similar products or different products; and (3) composting, which is a process of biological decomposition of solid organic debris, such as leaves, grass

clippings, and other organic material commonly found in the municipal waste stream, to create usable material.

The legislature amended the California Integrated Waste Management Act in 2007 through SB 1016. Previously, AB 939 had required the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) to review a jurisdiction's SRRE and household hazardous waste element (HHWE) at least once every 2 years. Under SB 1016, which repealed that requirement, CalRecycle instead was required to make a finding as to whether each jurisdiction was in compliance with AB 939's diversion requirements for calendar year 2006 and to determine compliance for the 2007 calendar year and later years based on the jurisdiction's change in its per capita disposal rate. CalRecycle is also required to review a jurisdiction's compliance with those diversion requirements in accordance with a specified schedule, which would be conditioned on the California Integrated Waste Management Board finding that the jurisdiction is in compliance with those requirements or has implemented its SRRE and HHWE.

SB 1016 also requires CalRecycle to issue an order of compliance if it finds that the jurisdiction has failed to make a good faith effort to implement its SRRE or its HHWE pursuant to a specified procedure. CalRecycle is required to comply with certain requirements in making this determination, including considering the extent to which the jurisdiction has maintained its per capita disposal rate.

### ***Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991***

AB 1327 (Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act), enacted in 1991, requires jurisdictions to adopt ordinances that require development projects to provide adequate storage areas for collection and removal of recyclable materials.

### ***Assembly Bill 341***

AB 341, which was enacted in 2011, states that it is the policy goal of the state that not less than 75% of solid waste generated be reduced, recycled, or composted by the year 2020. The bill also requires that a business, defined to include a commercial or public entity, that generates more than 4 cubic yards of commercial solid waste per week or is a multifamily residential dwelling of five units or more arrange for recycling services, on and after July 1, 2012. Jurisdictions, on and after July 1, 2012, are required to implement a commercial solid waste recycling program or revise their SRRE to meet this requirement.

### ***California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery***

CalRecycle is the new home of California's recycling and waste reduction efforts. Officially known as the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, CalRecycle is a new

department within the California Natural Resources Agency and administers programs formerly managed by the California Integrated Waste Management Board and Division of Recycling. CalRecycle is the State agency charged with the primary responsibility for permitting of solid waste facilities. CalRecycle operates through its designated Local Enforcement Agencies (LEAs), which typically are county health departments. Air pollution from solid waste facilities is regulated by local air pollution control districts or air quality management districts, while water pollution is regulated by RWQCBs.

### ***Universal Waste Regulations***

Universal wastes are hazardous wastes that are widely produced by households and many different types of businesses. Universal wastes include televisions, computers, and other electronic devices as well as batteries, fluorescent lamps, and mercury thermostats and other mercury-containing equipment, among others. The hazardous waste regulations identify seven categories of hazardous wastes that can be managed as universal wastes. Any unwanted item that falls within one of these waste streams can be handled, transported, and recycled following the simple requirements set forth in the universal waste regulations (22 CCR Division 4.5, Chapter 23).

SB 1016 repeals this review schedule on January 1, 2018, and, after that date, requires CalRecycle to review each jurisdiction's SRRE and HHWE at least once every 2 years.

### **Local Regulations**

#### ***Western Placer Waste Management Authority***

The WPWMA is a regional agency composed of Placer County and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. The WPWMA provides recycling and waste disposal opportunities to those communities, as well as to the City of Auburn and the Town of Loomis. The WPWMA oversees operations of the MRF, the WRSL, and the Permanent Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility. The MRF receives, separates, processes, and markets recyclable materials removed from delivered solid waste.

The City of Roseville entered into a flow control agreement with the WPWMA in 2005. This agreement states that any waste generated within the City must first be processed at the WPWMA MRF for sorting and then sent to the WRSL for disposal. Temporary construction and demolition debris must go through the MRF as well. Any materials that are collected through recycling programs that are established by the City, such as the collection of green waste, cardboard, newspaper, and other recyclables, does not have to be delivered to the MRF. The City of Roseville retains the rights to market any collected recyclables.

### *Placer County Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency*

Placer County Environmental Health Services has been certified by CalRecycle as the LEA to enforce state solid waste statutes and regulations within the County. The LEA's primary functions are permitting, inspection, and enforcement at solid waste operations and facilities such as landfills/disposal sites (active and closed), including sites for disposal of construction/demolition debris and inert materials; transfer stations, including materials recovery facilities; and composting facilities.

### *City of Roseville General Plan and Zoning Ordinance*

As described previously, the City's Solid Waste Collection and Disposal SRRE is part of the City of Roseville General Plan, Public Facilities Element (City of Roseville 2013a), and contains goals and policies for solid waste disposal. Chapter 9.17 of the Municipal Code (City of Roseville 2013b) includes provision for refuse hauling and recycling. The Environmental Utilities Department has also prepared a Household Hazardous Waste Plan and a Non-Disposal Facilities Plan, which have been approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Applicable goals and policies from the City's General Plan are listed below.

**Goal 2** Provide solid waste collection and disposal services to all existing and future Roseville development through the City's Solid Waste Utility. The provision of services by another provider may be considered where it is determined that such service is beneficial to the City and its customers or the provision of City services is not feasible.

**Goal 3** Continue to participate in local and regional approaches to source reduction, material recovery, recycling, and solid waste disposal.

**Policy 2:** Comply with the source reduction and recycling standards mandated by the State by reducing the projected quantity of solid waste disposed at the regional landfill by 50%, as well as any mandated future reductions.

**Policy 5:** Develop public education and recycling programs (City of Roseville 2013a).

## **4.11.12 Impacts**

### **Methods of Analysis**

Using the City's solid waste generation rate for commercial uses of 2.5 pounds per 100 square feet, the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 547 tons of solid

waste annually. All waste collected is first sent to the MRF for processing, with any remaining waste being sent to the WRS�. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the total amount of solid waste generated by operation of the project would be disposed of at the WRS�.

### Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the City’s General Plan, and professional judgment, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would do the following:

- Be served by a landfill or MRF with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs; or
- Fail to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

| Impact 4.11-7                              | Capacity for Solid Waste Disposal at the MRF or WRS�  |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | AB 939<br>City of Roseville Municipal Code, Chapter 9.17<br>City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant   |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required   |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant   |

The proposed project would generate solid waste associated with construction activities as well as from project operation. Solid waste from project operation would be generated by the café and bistro, administrative offices, general use of the facility, and green waste from landscaping. To minimize the amount of solid waste generated by the project, as specified in the City’s design/construction standards for solid waste (City of Roseville 2013c, Chapter 9.17), the project contractor would meet with the City’s designated environmental utilities inspector prior to beginning work to ensure that an approved plan is in place to recycle, store, and dispose of all construction debris according to relevant federal, state, and local statutes. In addition, the project includes an on-site recycling program to recycle construction debris as well as waste from project operation. Not factoring in on-site recycling, operation of the project is estimated to generate approximately 547 tons of solid waste annually. All the waste would first go to the MRF for sorting to capture any recyclable materials. The remaining waste would then be shipped to the WRS� for disposal.

The additional amount of solid waste generated by the project that would require disposal at the WRS� does not factor in waste reclaimed at the MRF to provide a more conservative estimate.

As noted above, the project is estimated to generate 547 tons per year, or less than 1.5 tons per day. Currently, the WRS� is permitted to accept up to 1,900 tons of refuse per day, and according to the County the average tonnage received is approximately 803 tons per day. The WRS� has a total capacity of 36,350,000 cubic yards. As of September 2012, the WRS� has a remaining capacity of 25,993,222 cubic yards. Under current projected development conditions, the landfill has a permitted lifespan extending through 2058.

Development of this site has been contemplated in long-range plans to provide solid waste disposal services for planned development within the City. Because there is capacity at the MRF to accommodate the project, as well as at the WRS�, the impact is **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-8                              | Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | AB 939<br>SB 1016<br>City of Roseville General Plan                       |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant   |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required   |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant   |

The project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes that relate to the disposal and recycling of solid waste. For example, the project contractor would meet with the City’s designated environmental utilities inspector prior to beginning work to ensure that an approved plan is in place to store, recycle, and dispose of all construction debris. The project also proposes an on-site recycling program to ensure that all recyclable waste generated during project construction or operation would be separated out prior to being picked up and delivered to the MRF. Therefore, the impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### 4.11.13 Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### 4.11.14 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative context for water supply is buildout of the City’s 2025 General Plan (City of Roseville 2013a), and the proposed Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan which is currently being processed by the City but is currently located within Placer County. The cumulative context for water supply does not include those Placer County projects including Regional University, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer Ranch, Riolo Vineyards, or the Curry Creek Community

Plan, as those project areas are expected to be supplied water by the Placer County Water Agency and not the City of Roseville.

The cumulative context for wastewater treatment is buildout of the SPWA service area. This includes growth not only within the 2005 SAB, but as well planned future Urban Grown Areas; that will create the ultimate service area boundary of the SPWA regional partners as documented in the SPWA Systems Evaluation report.

The cumulative context for solid waste is buildout of the City’s 2025 General Plan (City of Roseville 2013a), the proposed Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan and Placer County projects including Regional University, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer Ranch, Riolo Vineyards and the anticipated Curry Creek Community Plan. The proponents of the proposed Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan intend to pursue annexation to the City if they are successful in achieving the following: completion by the City of environmental review for the proposed project; approval of the proposed Specific Plan; and action by the Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) amending the City’s existing sphere of influence to include the subject property. The Curry Creek Community Plan is a possible future County plan that would cover land immediately west of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan and south of the approved Regional University Specific Plan. Although the Board of Supervisors indicated an interest in pursuing such a Community Plan in the early 2000s, no specific actions have been taken to develop a Community Plan, so it remains unclear as to when, if ever, a Community Plan will be formulated and approved. With the exception of Amoruso Ranch, which is proposing to receive water supply from the City’s water system, the other above-described projects in the Placer County unincorporated area, will or would be supplied water from the Placer County Water Agency, rather than the City.

| Impact 4.11-9                              | Cumulative Increase in Demand for Water Supply and Treatment Capacity  |
|--|--|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan Policies<br>Urban Water Management Plan<br>City of Roseville Water Conservation Ordinance |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant  |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required  |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant  |

Detailed information on the City’s water supply and water demands are documented in the City’s most recent Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Westbrook Amendment dated March 2012. As documented in the WSA, City build out water demands are expected to reach 63,316 AFY. This figure includes the development of the site for the proposed

project, the water demand for which was included in the Sierra Vista WSA. This figure increases to a total cumulative water demand of 64,503 acre-feet when the proposed Amoruso Ranch and certain other smaller projects (Pearl Creek Apts [recently approved], West Roseville Specific Plan Phase 4 [recently approved], and Fiddymont Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 [being processed]) are taken into account. Available recycled water supplies are estimated at 4,568 acre-feet, resulting in a total surface water supply need of 59,935 acre-feet. While this amount is 6,065 AFY less than the City's total contracted water supplies of 66,000 AFY, it is 1,034 acre-feet more than the City's WFA limitation on diversions from the American River in wet/normal years of 58,900 acre-feet. This is a significant cumulative impact.

Because the pace and timing of regional developments in Placer County through 2030 is currently unknown, and because the above-referenced pending projects not currently contemplated by the City's General Plan may never come to fruition, the specific additional water supplies and the timing for obtaining them to serve potential future projects are uncertain. Should the full cumulative water demand materialize, the City would need to secure additional water supplies prior to approval of any new development areas such as Amoruso Ranch. Future water supplies would likely come from one or more of the following sources: additional cooperative agreements between WFA water purveyors for surface water from the American River, mandatory conservation measures, and new surface water diversions from the Sacramento River. It is anticipated that even with a new supply source, the City's surface water supply under the WFA would be insufficient to meet all demands during drier water-year types under the City's cumulative buildout demand (defined in this context to go beyond the current General Plan boundary). As such, additional groundwater withdrawals in years when the surface supply is projected to be insufficient to fully meet water demands would be required. The cumulative impact associated with buildout of potential proposed projects would therefore be significant. However, cumulative water demand associated with buildout of the SSP in all year types, which includes the project site, has been previously factored into the City's plans for water treatment and for securing additional sources of water to serve existing and proposed development. The project's incremental contribution to this cumulative impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., **less than significant**) because development of the SSP, anticipated since 1998, would be supplied by existing and assured sources of City water, and will consume a comparatively tiny amount of water when viewed on a City-wide scale. The project site can be served with existing supplies, and is not dependent on the need for any of the potential future supplies described above.

| Impact 4.11-10                             | Cumulative Increase in Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Plant Capacity |
|--|---|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | NPDES Permit  |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant   |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required   |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant   |

Wastewater from the proposed project would be treated at the DCWWTP. As noted above, the City prepared the South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Systems Evaluation, June 2007 and updated December, 2009) which delineates the 2005 regional wastewater service area boundary (2005 SAB) and provides baseline and projected characterizations of its regional wastewater and recycled water systems. The Systems Evaluation is also the long-term planning tool to project wastewater treatment needs and to identify necessary capital improvement projects to accommodate urban growth within the 2005 SAB. The Systems Evaluation document addressed system conditions as of June 2004 and anticipated buildout conditions within the 2005 SAB. Buildout of the 2005 SAB, including rezones and intensifications, would result in 16.34 mgd ADWF at the DCWWTP and 16.52 mgd ADWF at the PGWWTP. Under the ultimate SPWA boundary (the current 2005 Service Area plus anticipated Urban Grown Areas), the ADWF of the DCWWTP, including the proposed project, is estimated at 19.98 mgd ADWF and the PGWWTP is estimated at 25.67 mgd ADWF (Table ES-6, Systems Evaluation, December 2009). This is considered a significant cumulative impact.

The demands for wastewater treatment have been factored into the City's long-range plans to provide these services. This includes growth not only within the 2005 SAB, but as well planned future Urban Growth Areas; that will create the ultimate service area boundary, of the SPWA regional partners as documented in the SPWA Systems Evaluation report. Potential expansion of the DCWWTP was identified in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Final EIR completed in May 1996 (City of Roseville 1996). Expansion of the plant to serve flows could result in impacts on the environment associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Dry Creek. The NPDES discharge permit for the plant would need to be amended to reflect higher flows. Growth assumptions factored into the expansion plans for the DCWWTP included approved development projects within the plant's service area, including buildout of the SSP. In addition, development of the project site was assumed with commercial uses that factored in a higher demand for wastewater treatment under the SSP (as discussed in Section 4.11.6 under Wastewater Treatment). The project's demand for wastewater treatment would be comparatively small when viewed within the context of the entire SAB and the project's incremental contribution would be considered **less than significant**.

| Impact 4.11-11                             | Cumulative Increase in Solid Waste       |
|--|--|
| Applicable Policies and Regulations        | City of Roseville General Plan<br>AB 939 |
| Significance with Policies and Regulations | Less than significant                    |
| Mitigation Measures                        | None required                            |
| Significance after Mitigation              | Less than significant                    |

Currently the MRF has permitted processing capacity up to 1,750 tons per day and the WRS� is permitted to accept waste through 2058. However, the need for processing capacity at the MRF and for a final closure date at the landfill would be influenced by several factors, including regional growth rates, economic conditions, and the efficiency of waste recovery. Depending on these factors, waste from the proposed project in combination with buildout of the City would shorten the lifespan of the MRF and the landfill. This is considered a significant cumulative impact.

The cumulative increase in solid waste associated with development of this site was previously assessed in the SSP EIR. The cumulative impact was determined to be less than significant and the lifespan of the WRS� was through 2022. Since the SSP was approved in 1998 solid waste associated with buildout of the SSP has been factored into expansion assumptions for the MRF and WRS�. Since development of the project site with commercial uses has previously been assumed and factored into expansion plans, the project’s anticipated incremental contribution to cumulative solid waste demand is therefore considered **less than significant**. In addition, the proposed project would be required to pay collection fees, a portion of which would be used to service bonds necessary to fund landfill expansions.

#### 4.11.6 Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### 4.11.7 Sources

California Water Code, Section 10750–10756. Groundwater Management Act.

City of Roseville. 1996. *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Draft EIR*. SCH No. 93092079. May 1996.

City of Roseville. 1998. *Stoneridge Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by EIP Associates. December 1998.

City of Roseville. 2007. *Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines*. Adopted March 18, 1998. Last amended March 28, 2007. <http://roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=2921>.

City of Roseville. 2010. *Creekview Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by City of Roseville.

City of Roseville. 2011. 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. August 2011. <http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=22733>.

City of Roseville. 2012. *Water Supply Assessment for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Westbrook Amendment*. March 2012. <http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=23269>.

City of Roseville. 2013a. *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*. As amended February 13, 2013. Roseville, California: City of Roseville Planning Department. Adopted May 5, 2010 (Resolution No. 10-161). Accessed May 2013. <http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=2546>.

City of Roseville. 2013b. Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19: Zoning. Accessed May 2013. <http://qcode.us/codes/roseville>.

City of Roseville. 2013c. 2013 Design/Construction Standards. Accessed May 2013. [http://www.roseville.ca.us/pw/engineering/land\\_development/design\\_construction\\_standards.asp](http://www.roseville.ca.us/pw/engineering/land_development/design_construction_standards.asp).

Placer County. 2013. *EIR Guidance Document*. Placer County Department of Facility Services, Environmental Engineering Division (Solid Waste).

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2006. “Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems.” State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2006-0003. May 2, 2006. <http://www.cwea.org/pdf/news/sso-wdr.pdf>.

Water Forum. 2000. “Water Forum Agreement.” Water Forum. January 2000. <http://www.waterforum.org/agreement.cfm>.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK