CITY OF ROSEVILLE CALIFORNIA

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT–PLANNING DIVISION
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 774-5276

INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number	Avia at Fiddyment Ranch, PL14-0504
Project Location	1900 Blue Oaks Boulevard
Project Description	The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit for a 300-unit apartment complex, consisting of 15 buildings, a clubhouse and pool, parking, and other related improvements.
Project Applicant	John Burkett, Pacific West Contractors of CA
Property Owner	James C. Ghielmetti, West Roseville Development Co
Lead Agency Contact	Lauren Hocker, Associate Planner; Phone: (916) 774-5272

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above-described project. The document relies on previous environmental documents and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project (see Attachments 1–3). Where documents were submitted by consultants working for the applicant, City staff reviewed such documents in order to determine whether, based on their own professional judgment and expertise, staff found such documents to be credible and persuasive. Staff has only relied on documents that reflect their independent judgment, and has not accepted at face value representations made by consultants for the applicant.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

In reviewing the site-specific information provided for this project, the City of Roseville Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that with mitigation the impacts are considered to be less than significant. As demonstrated in the initial study checklist, there are no "project specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site" that cannot be reduced to less than significant effects through mitigation (CEQA Section 15183) and therefore an EIR **is not** required. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation,** we find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

Prepared by: original signature on file Date: 12.12.14
Lauren Hocker, Associate Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves the construction of a 300-unit apartment complex on an approximately 12-acre site. The complex includes 15 three-story apartment buildings, a central clubhouse and pool, and common area amenities near the clubhouse (play structures, bar-b-que area, grassy areas, and pathways). The buildings will occupy approximately 3.4 acres of the site, paving for parking and driveways will take up 4.6 acres, and the remaining 4 acres will be landscaped area. The project includes 593 parking spaces (225 of which are in garages). The project is surrounded on all four sides by existing roadways, and will include access driveways to three of them: Orchard View Lane, Harvey Way, and Oak Meadow Drive. There is existing sidewalk on some of these roads, but most of the sidewalk is either absent and will be installed as part of the project, or is present but will need to be removed and replaced as part of construction activities.

Much of the site is at a higher elevation than the surrounding roadways, and will need to be leveled in order to build the project. Approximately 37,000 cubic yards of soil will be exported off of the project site. The soil will be exported to sites which already have approved entitlements and environmental documents that considered the import of soil. There are multiple sites under consideration, including the property directly across Harvey Way from this project (the approved Oakbriar subdivision) and Parcel F-9 (a proposed subdivision currently in process, as application number PL14-0438). Grading cannot occur on either this project site or the sites where the fill will be exported unless both sites have approved grading plans from Engineering. Thus, there are existing mechanisms to ensure that fill from the site is only placed where that fill has already been anticipated and examined through environmental analysis as part of another approved project; the issue needs no further discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is undeveloped, but is surrounded by improvements and was used to stockpile soil. The soil deposited on the site has created a hilly condition, but occurred long enough in the past that the entire site is covered with grasses and herbaceous annuals. Owing to the disturbed site conditions, yellow starthistle and other invasive or "weed" species are prevalent on the site. There are two deep, linear depressions in the southeastern corner of the site which were created for stormwater conveyance.

The site is square, and is surrounded on all four sides by roadways. The roadways on the eastern, western, and northern property boundaries are small, two lane streets, while the roadway on the southern side is a four-lane arterial. The properties to the east and to the south of the site are developed with single-family homes (Residential Small-Lot and Residential Mixed Use zoning, respectively), while the properties to the north and west are undeveloped. The undeveloped property on the west of the site is designated for commercial uses (Community Commercial zoning), while the property to the north has an approved subdivision map for single-family homes (Residential Small-Lot zoning).

UNIFORMLY APPLIED POLICIES AND STANDARDS

For projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, CEQA Guidelines section 15183, as noted earlier, allows a lead agency to rely on previously adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects, when the standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence, that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects, unless substantial new information shows otherwise (CEQA Guidelines §1583(f)). The City of Roseville adopted CEQA Implementing Procedures (Implementing Procedures) which are consistent with the CEQA Guidelines section. The current version of the Implementing Procedures were adopted in April 2008, along with Findings of Fact, as Resolution 08-172. The below regulations and ordinances were found to provide uniform mitigating policies and standards, and are applicable to development projects. The City's Mitigating Policies and Standards are referenced, where applicable, in the Initial Study Checklist.

- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])

- Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch. 14.20)
- Stormwater Quality Design Manual (Resolution 07-432)
- City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-137)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)[1]
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- West Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 04-40)

The project is located within the West Roseville Specific Plan. Throughout this document, analyses will state that impacts were already disclosed and mitigated as part of the "Specific Plan EIR," or similar; this refers to the West Roseville Specific Plan EIR.

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

- Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- Subsequent EIR & Roseville 2020 Transportation System Capital Improvement Program Update
- West Roseville Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- Fiddyment Ranch Phase 3 Subsequent Environmental Impact Report

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, any project which is consistent with the development densities established by zoning, a Community Plan, or a General Plan for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site.

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan project included an overall Amendment of the City of Roseville General Plan, including updates to policy text. The Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan included an analysis of the updated General Plan land use designations and policies, including amending the General Plan from a 2020 to a 2025 horizon year. The proposed project is consistent with the adopted General Plan land use designations. This analysis included an updated city-wide traffic analysis and a corresponding update to the City's Capital Improvement Program.

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP), where the project is located. This Final Environmental Impact Report established Plan-wide mitigation measures resulting from noise analysis, wetland delineations, tree surveys, and other technical work. The Fiddyment Ranch Phase 3 Subsequent Environmental Impact Report amended a portion of the West Roseville Specific Plan area. While this Amendment did not include the project site, it did update to the water supply assessment and utility infrastructure plans for the entire WRSP.

This analysis relies on the above environmental documents to adequately disclose and mitigate Plan-wide and City-wide effects. The analysis, supporting technical materials, and findings of the environmental documents listed above are incorporated by reference, and are available for review at the Civic Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA. This Initial Study focuses on effects particular to the specific project site, impacts which were not analyzed within the EIR, and impacts which may require revisiting due to substantial new information. When applicable, the topical sections within the Initial Study summarize the findings within the aforementioned environmental documents. In some cases, mitigation measures already applicable through the WRSP are included as mitigation herein, to reflect changes in standard mitigation language that have occurred since WRSP approval. These changes do not affect the purpose or fundamental substance of the mitigation; they merely clarify.

EXPLANATION OF INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines recommend that lead agencies use an Initial Study Checklist to determine potential impacts of the proposed project to the physical environment. The Initial Study Checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially

[1] Note that the Tree Preservation Ordinance was moved into the Zoning Ordinance as Section 19.66.

affected by this project. This section of the Initial Study incorporates a portion of Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines.

There are four (4) possible answers to the Environmental Impacts Checklist on the following pages. Each possible answer is explained herein:

1) A "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from the information that a fair argument based on substantial evidence can be made to support a conclusion that a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change may occur to any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. When one or more "Potentially significant Impact" entries are made, and EIR is required.

2) A "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" answer is appropriate where the applicant has agreed to incorporate a mitigation measure to reduce an impact from "Potentially Significant" to a "Less than Significant." For instance, impacts to flood waters could be reduced from a "potentially significant impact" to a "less than significant impact" by relocating a building to an area outside of the floodway. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are identified as MM followed by a number.

3) A "Less Than significant Impact" answer is appropriate if there is evidence that one or more environmental impacts may occur, but the impacts are determined to be less than significant, or that the application of development policies and standards to the project will reduce the impact(s) to a less than significant level. For instance, the application of the City's Improvement Standards reduces potential erosion impacts to a less than significant impact.

4) A "No Impact" answer is appropriate where it can be clearly seen that the impact at hand does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment. For instance, a project in the center of an urbanized area will clearly not have an adverse effect on agricultural resources or operations.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each response. A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as generous standards.

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment.

II. Aesthetics

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Zoning Ordinance (e.g. building height, setbacks, etc), Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Ch. 18), Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347), and applicable Specific Plan and/or Specific Plan Design Guidelines will prevent significant impacts related to items a, b, and c, below. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				**X**
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				**X**
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			**X**	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			**X**	

a–b) There are no designated or eligible scenic vistas or scenic highways within or adjacent to the City of Roseville.

c) The project site is in an urbanizing setting, and as a result lacks any prominent or high-quality natural features which could be negatively impacted by development. The existing viewshed includes many visual encroachments and is not intact. The site and parcels to the north and west are currently vacant, but have been used to stockpile soil and are surrounded by completed roadways, pending development of the sites. The City of Roseville has adopted Community Design Guidelines (CDG) for the purpose of creating building and community designs which are a visual asset to the community. The CDG includes guidelines for building design, site design and landscape design, which will result in a project that enhances the existing urban visual environment. Accordingly, the aesthetic impacts of the project are less than significant.

d) The project involves nighttime lighting to provide for the security and safety of project users. However, the project is already located within an urbanized setting with many existing lighting sources. Lighting is conditioned to comply with City standards (i.e. CDG) to limit the height of light standards and to require cut-off lenses and glare shields to minimize light and glare impacts. The project will not create a new source of substantial light. None of the project elements are highly reflective, and thus the project will not contribute to an increased source of glare.

II. Agricultural Resources

The State Department of Conservation oversees the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which was established to document the location, quality, and quantity of agricultural lands, and the conversion of those lands over time. The primary land use classifications on the maps generated through this program are: Urban and Built Up Land, Grazing Land, Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland. Only the latter three categories are called out as protected farmland categories within CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				**X**
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				**X**
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				**X**

a–c) According to the California Department of Conservation Placer County Important Farmland Map (2010), the majority of the City of Roseville is designated as Urban and Built Up Land, most of the open space areas of the City are designated as Grazing Land, and there is one area designated as Farmland of Local Importance. None of the land within the City boundaries is designated as a protected farmland category (Prime, Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland). The current Williamson Act Contract map (2013/2014) produced by the Department of Conservation shows that there are no Williamson Act contracts within the City, and only one (on PFE Road) that is adjacent to the City. None of the land within the City is considered forest land by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. The project site is not used for agricultural purposes, and does not include agricultural zoning. Given the foregoing, the proposed project will have no impact on agricultural resources.

III. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			**X**	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			**X**	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			**X**	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			**X**	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			**X**	
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			**X**	
g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			**X**	

a–b) The City of Roseville, along with the south Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Non-Attainment Area. Under the Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a "serious non-attainment" area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, “non-attainment” for the state ozone standard, and a "non-attainment" area for the federal and state PM_{10} standard (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Within Placer County, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for ensuring that emission standards are not violated. Project-related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. To assist in making this determination, the PCAPCD developed thresholds of significance, which were developed by considering both the health-based ambient air quality standards

and the attainment strategies outlined in the SIP. The PCAPCD-recommended significance threshold is 82 pounds daily of ROG, NO_x, or PM, which is the threshold applied for both construction-related emissions and operational emissions.

The discussions below focus on emissions of ROG, NO_x, or PM. Analyses are not included for sulfur dioxide, lead, and other constituents because there are no mass emission thresholds; these are concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards which require substantial, point-source emissions (e.g. refineries, concrete plants, etc) before exceedance will occur, and the SVAB is in attainment for these constituents. Likewise, carbon monoxide is not analyzed because the SVAB is in attainment for this constituent, and it requires high localized concentrations (called carbon monoxide "hot spots") before the ambient air quality standard would be exceeded. "Hot spots" are typically associated with heavy traffic congestion occurring at high-volume roadway intersections. The Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 EIR analysis of Citywide traffic indicated that 150 out of the 158 signalized intersections in the City would operate at level of service C or better. It further indicated that analyses of existing CO concentrations at the most congested intersections in Roseville indicate that CO levels are well below federal and state ambient air quality standards.

The Sierra Vista EIR concluded that the build-out of allocated land uses within the City would have significant adverse air quality impacts resulting from ROG and NO_x, and from inconsistency with the applicable goals and policies of the local air quality plans. The adverse cumulative impacts could not be mitigated to a less than significant level, even with the mitigation measures proposed in the EIR. Therefore, the City Council adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations with respect to air quality impacts. The Project will not contribute any additional impacts which were not previously analyzed, nor is there substantial new information which would require altering or augmenting the prior analysis. PCAPCD staff reviewed the project, and submitted a letter (Attachment 1) recommending that the mitigation established in the WRSP be applied to the proposed project, with minor modifications to reflect current standard language. This mitigation has been included in this Initial Study, below, to ensure that the modifications to standard language are carried forward for this project. The measures recommended by the District have been modified slightly below, to remove inapplicable language (there are no structures, so Item 3 of the measure does not apply) and to replace all "recommend" language with "shall" language, as is appropriate for mitigation.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Construction-Related Air Pollutants

In order to reduce construction-generated PM_{10} emissions, the contractor shall comply with the dust control strategies developed by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The following standard measures, or the standard PCAPCD measures current at the time of construction, shall apply:

A. A Dust Control Plan shall be submitted and approved by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance.

   1. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, (whichever occurs first), on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving District approval, of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit.

   2. The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower of greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the District prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.

   3. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the District for approval demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and

subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average of 20% of NOx and 45% of DPM 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.

B. Include the following standard notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan, or as an attached form:

1. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.

2. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.

3. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to limit idling to a maximum of 5 minutes.

4. Idling of construction related equipment and construction related vehicles should not occur within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor.

C. Include the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations as standard notes, or as an attached form, to all subsequent Grading/Improvement Plans.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Operation-Related Air Pollutants

To ensure a reduction in onsite, long-term operational emissions, the developer shall include in construction documents or otherwise demonstrate compliance with the below requirements. The following standard measures, or the standard PCAPCD measures current at the time of construction, shall apply:

A. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall pay into the District's Offsite Mitigation Program to offset the Project's cumulative contribution of criteria pollutants. The fee amount shall be based on the amount specified in the Development Agreements, Section 3.15.11 Air Quality Program (2004) and Section 3.27 Air Quality Mitigation Fee (2006).

B. Wood burning or pellet appliances shall not be permitted in multi-family developments. Only natural gas or propane fired fireplace appliances are permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the Floor Plans submitted in conjunction with the Building Permit application. (Based on APCD Rule 225, Section 302.2).

C. Stationary sources or processes (e.g., backup generators, certain types of engines, boilers, heaters, etc.) associated with this project shall be required to obtain an Authority to Construct (ATC) permit from the District prior to the construction. In general, the following types of sources shall be required to obtain a permit: 1). Any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower, 2). Any boiler that produces heat in excess of 1,000,000 Btu per hour, or 3) Any equipment or process which discharges 2 lbs per day or more of pollutants. (Based on APCD Rule 501 and the California Health & Safety Code, Section 39013).

D. Include the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations as standard notes, or as an attached form, to all subsequent Building Permits for the operational phase of the Project.

c) According to the PCAPCD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (*Handbook*), the PCAPCD recommends the use of a cumulative threshold of significance for land use projects of 10 pounds per day for ROG and NO_X. Although described as a significance threshold, the *Handbook* specifically states that the threshold should not be used to determine whether to prepare an EIR; in other words, that it is not intended to be used as a threshold for significance. The *Handbook* recommends that the "threshold" be used to determine when to apply mitigation for cumulative impacts. Given that it is not recommended for use as a threshold for determining the significance of a cumulative impact, the City (acting as CEQA lead agency), has chosen to rely on a two-tier cumulative analysis methodology similar to that adopted by the Sacramento

Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), as outlined in the SMAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. The City is located within the SVAB, which is the same air basin where the SMAQMD methodology is used by numerous CEQA lead agencies; on these grounds, the City finds use of this methodology to be appropriate.

The first analysis tier involves determining whether a project would result in significant project-level criteria air pollutant emissions for which the region is designated non-attainment (i.e., exceed the PCAPCD-recommended project threshold of 82 lbs/day for ROG or NO_x). If it does not, then project emissions would not be considered cumulatively considerable. Should a project exceed the thresholds, a Tier 2 evaluation is conducted to determine whether project emissions would jeopardize implementation of the SIP, which is a methodology consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 (h)(3). Under the Tier 2 analysis, projects found to be consistent with the SIP and which would not conflict with the SIP emissions budget are considered less than cumulatively considerable.

A Plan-wide analysis was already prepared for the WRSP, and found that development of the Plan area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to the emission of ROG and NO_x). Mitigation to offset operational emissions of air pollutants was already included, and has been included–as updated–in this Initial Study (refer to criteria a and b, above). The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

d) As described in section a–b, the project will not result in any new impacts related to criteria pollutants beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant. Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) are also of public health concern, but no thresholds or standards are provided. There are hundreds of constituents which are classified as TAC, and they are typically generated by stationary sources like gas stations, facilities using solvents, and heavy industrial operations. The Air Resources Board has published the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook – A Community Health Perspective (*April 2005), which lists TAC sources and recommended buffers. The proposed project is not a TAC-generating use, nor is it within the specified buffer area of a TAC-generating use. Impacts are less than significant.

e) Diesel fumes from construction equipment and delivery trucks are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is temporary and diesel emissions would be minimal and regulated. Typical urban projects such as residences and retail businesses generally do not result in substantial objectionable odors when operated in compliance with City Ordinances (e.g. proper trash disposal and storage). The Project is a typical urban development that lacks any characteristics that would cause the generation of substantial unpleasant odors. Thus, construction and operation of the proposed project would not be expected to result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. A review of the project surroundings indicates that there are, likewise, no developments which would expose the project to substantial objectionable odors. Impacts related to odors are less than significant.

f–g) In September 2006, Assembly Bill (AB) 32 was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger of California. AB 32 requires that California GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) was delegated the authority to implement AB 32, and CARB subsequently prepared the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) for California, which was approved in 2008 and amended in May 2014. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions. There are multiple ways to measure the appropriate reduction for projects, two of which were used within the Scoping Plan: the reduction needed from a known baseline condition, or the reduction needed from a projected future condition. The Scoping Plan established that reducing emissions to 1990 levels was equivalent to a 15% reduction from 2005 levels (which was the existing condition year) and a 29% reduction in GHG levels relative to an estimated 2020 "Business As Usual" (BAU) scenario. The data has been updated several times. The current Scoping Plan indicates that statewide emissions of GHG in 1990 amounted to 431 million metric tons, and that the 2020 BAU is estimated as 509 million metric tons. This means that the reduction from BAU is now calculated as 18 percent from a 2020 BAU, rather than 29 percent.

The City of Roseville has pursued sustainability planning that has included an emissions inventory and budget. The City of Roseville Communitywide Sustainability Plan (SAP) was adopted in February 2012. Though this was not a qualifying Climate Action Plan pursuant to CEQA, it can be relied upon as a technical study to support future analyses. The greenhouse gas inventory prepared as part of the SAP indicates that 1,202,383 metric tons (1.2 million metric tons) were emitted by the community in the year 2008 and that the 2020 BAU was estimated at 1,385,942 metric tons (1.4 million metric tons).

The PCAPCD recommends that the threshold of significance for GHG emissions selected by lead agencies be related to compliance with AB 32. In accordance with CARB and PCAPCD recommendations, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, requires a quantitative GHG analysis for development projects in order to demonstrate a project would promote sustainability and implement operational GHG emissions reduction strategies that would achieve the target emissions goal of AB 32. The target goal is reducing GHG emissions by 18% below 2020 BAU levels. BAU is defined as the emissions which would result from development if it were built and operated under the same standards and conditions ("business as usual") that existed during the period of the initial inventory prepared for the Scoping Plan, which was the year 2005. GHGs were not addressed in the WRSP EIR, so a project-specific analysis using the California Emission's Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was prepared. The model results summaries are included as Attachment 2 (BAU) and Attachment 3 (Year 2020 project). The detailed outputs can be reviewed at the Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

Construction emissions were included in the analysis, but are of negligible impact. While emissions from the actual use of new buildings adds a permanent increase in emissions, emissions from construction activities cease once a project is complete. On a cumulative level, though construction may increase or decrease in a given year due to market demand, the average amount of construction undertaken does not tend to increase over time. For this reason, even without mitigation the amount of annual emissions resulting from construction is expected to decrease over time as a result of the implementation of existing regulations (such as the low carbon fuel standard) and fleet turnover to cleaner-burning and more efficient stock. An analysis of the data for off-road equipment within the EMFAC (Emissions Factor Model) 2011 indicates that heavy-duty off-road vehicle emissions will be lowered by approximately 11% between 2005 and 2020.

As shown by comparing the model results in Attachments B and C, under a BAU scenario the project is anticipated to generate 3,896 metric tons of GHG, while under a year 2020 scenario the project is anticipated to generate 2,900 metric tons of GHG. This represents a 26% reduction in GHG from the BAU scenario. As state above, where a project can be demonstrated to result in a minimum 18% reduction from a BAU scenario, it can be concluded that the project's GHG impacts are not significant, and that the project will not hinder the ability of the State to reach its emissions reduction targets; impacts are less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City of Roseville Tree Preservation ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66) will prevent significant impacts related to loss of native oak trees, referenced by item e, below. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			**X**	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			**X**	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			**X**	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			**X**	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			**X**	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				**X**

a–c,e) The site has been subject to grading activities, use as a site for soil stockpiling, and has been disturbed by adjacent roadway work. As described in the environmental setting, the site is dominated by non-native species, including some invasive species. There are no resources of biological value on the site, and thus there will be no substantial impacts to protected biological resources or any conflicts with local policies designed to protect those resources.

d) An interconnected network of open space corridors and preserves is located throughout the City–and in the WRSP–to ensure that the movement of wildlife is not substantially impeded as the City develops. The

development of the project site will not negatively impact these existing and planned open space corridors, nor is the project site located in an area that is vital or important for the movement of wildlife or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

f) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans; Natural Community Conservation Plans; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			**X**	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			**X**	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			**X**	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			**X**	

a–d) No cultural resources are known to exist on the project site per the WRSP EIR; however, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to cultural resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the WRSP EIR; project-specific impacts are less than significant.

VI. Geology and Soils

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80) and Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to item b, below. The Ordinance and standards include permit requirements for construction and development in erosion-prone areas and to ensure that grading activities will not result in significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			**X**	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)			**X**	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			**X**	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			**X**	
iv) Landslides?			**X**	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			**X**	
c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				**X**
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				**X**
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				**X**

a) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides.

i–iii) According to United States Geological Service mapping and literature, active faults are largely considered those which have had movement within the last 10,000 years (within the Holocene or Historic time periods)[2] and there are no major active faults in Placer County. The California

[2] United States Geological Survey, http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=active%20fault, Accessed June 2014

Geological Survey has prepared a map of the state which shows the earthquake shaking potential of areas throughout California based primarily on an area's distance from known active faults. The map shows that the City lies in a relatively low-intensity groundshaking zone. Commercial, institutional, and residential buildings as well as all related infrastructure are required, in conformance with Chapter 16, *Structural Design Requirements*, Division IV, *Earthquake Design* of the California Building Code, to lessen the exposure to potentially damaging vibrations through seismic resistant design. In compliance with the Code, all structures in the Project area would be well-built to withstand ground shaking from possible earthquakes in the region; impacts are less than significant.

iv) Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. The existing and proposed slopes are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are less than significant.

b) Grading activities will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over-covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). Grading activities for the project will be limited to the project site. The Engineering Division will review the Grading and Improvement Plans for consistency with the City's Improvement Standards. Grading activities require a grading permit from the Engineering Division. The grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with the City's Improvement Standards, including the provision of proper drainage, appropriate dust control and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures will be incorporated into the required grading plans. Therefore, the impacts associated with disruption, displacement, and compaction of soils associated with the project are considered less than significant.

c, d) A review of the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Placer County, accessed via the Web Soil Survey (http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/), indicates that the soils on the site are Alamo-Fiddyment complex (0–5% slopes), Cometa-Fiddyment complex (1–5% slopes), and Ramona sandy loam (2-9% slopes). These soils are not listed as unstable. While the other soils do not have high expansive potential, the Alamo-Fiddyment complex is listed as having a high expansive soil potential. Expansive soils swell when wet and shrink when dry, which can cause building foundation problems. This soil type is restricted to the southeastern corner of the site, and the issue can easily be managed with standard construction practices. City Engineering requires the submittal of a soil report with all Improvement Plans, and further requires that all foundations for residential projects be certified by a geotechnical engineer. Existing standards and regulations are sufficient to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

e) The proposed project would be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system and would not involve the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			**X**	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			**X**	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			**X**	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				**X**
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				**X**
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area?				**X**
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			**X**	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				**X**

a, b) A material is defined as hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local regulatory agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency.

Standard construction activities would require the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, lubricants, glues, paints and paint thinners, soaps, bleach, and solvents. These are common household and commercial materials routinely used by both businesses and average members of the public. The materials only pose a hazard if they are improperly used, stored, or transported either through upset conditions (e.g. a vehicle accident) or mishandling. In addition to construction use, the operational project would result in the use of common hazardous materials as well, including bleach, solvents, and herbicides. Regulations pertaining to the transport of materials are codified in 49 CFR 171–180, and transport regulations are enforced and monitored by the California Department of Transportation and by the California Highway Patrol. Specifications for storage on a construction site are contained in various regulations and codes, including the California Code of Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and the California Health and Safety Code. These same codes require that all hazardous materials be used and stored in the manner specified on the material packaging. Existing regulations and programs are sufficient to ensure that potential impacts as a result of the use or storage of hazardous materials are reduced to less than significant levels.

c) See response to Items (a) and (b) above. While development of the site will result in the use, handling, and transport of materials deemed to be hazardous, the materials in question are commonly used in both residential and commercial applications, and include materials such as bleach and herbicides. The project will not result in the use of any acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

d) The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; therefore, no impact will occur.

e–f) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area, no airports are located within two miles of the project site, and the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impact would occur.

g) This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services and development of the site has been anticipated and incorporated into emergency response plans. As such, the project will cause a less than significant impact to the City's Emergency Response or Management Plans. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with all local, State and Federal requirements for the handling of hazardous materials. Conditions will also be applied to the project requiring compliance with all local, State and Federal requirements for the handling and/or storage of hazardous materials. These conditions will require the following programs:

- A Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) shall be required of uses that handle toxic and/or hazardous materials in quantities regulated by the California Health and Safety Code and/or the City.

- Businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials shall complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) pursuant to local, State, or Federal requirements.

h) The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the state agency responsible for wildland fire protection and management. As part of that task, CAL FIRE maintains maps designating Wildland Fire Hazard Severity zones. The City is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and is not in a CAL FIRE responsibility area; fire suppression is entirely within local responsibility. The project site is in an urban area, and therefore would not expose people to any risk from wildland fire. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch. 9.80) will prevent significant impacts related to items g, h, and i, below. The Ordinance includes standard requirements for all new construction, including regulation of development with the potential to impede or redirect flood flows, and prohibits development within flood hazard areas. It is also indicated that compliance with the City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107), Urban Stormwater

Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch. 14.20), and Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions (Resolutions 07-432) will prevent significant impacts related to item a, below. The standards require preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan for construction activities and includes designs to control pollutants within post-construction urban water runoff. Finally, it is indicated that the Drainage Fees for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Watersheds (RMC Ch.4.48) and City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to item e, below. The ordinance and standards require the collection of drainage fees to fund improvements that mitigate potential flooding impacts, and require the design of a water drainage system that will adequately convey anticipated stormwater flows. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			**X**	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			**X**	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			**X**	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			**X**	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			**X**	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			**X**	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				**X**
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				**X**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				**X**
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				**X**

a,c–f) The project will involve the disturbance of on-site soils and the construction of impervious surfaces, such as asphalt paving and buildings. Disturbing the soil can allow sediment to be mobilized by rain or wind, and cause displacement into waterways. To address this and other issues, the developer is required to receive approval of a grading permit prior to the start of construction. The permit is required to incorporate mitigation measures for dust and erosion control. In addition, the City has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board which requires the City to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. The City does this, in part, by means of the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards, which require preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. All permanent stormwater quality control measures must be designed to comply with the City's Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development, the City's 2013 Design/Construction Standards, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, and Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions. For these reasons, impacts related to water quality are less than significant.

b) No groundwater withdrawal is proposed, and due to the site's relatively small size, the proposed project will have no impact on groundwater supplies and will not significantly affect groundwater recharge.

d) The project is consistent with the Drainage Master Plan which was prepared as part of the WRSP EIR, and as such will not substantially alter drainage in such a way as to cause flooding.

g,h) According to the City's 2025 General Plan Floodplain Map, the project is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not place housing or any structures within an area at risk of flood flows. There would be no impact with regard to these criteria.

i) Folsom Dam, which is located approximately 10 miles southeast of the project site, is the closet dam to the project site. While portions of the City could be subject to flooding in the event of failure or damage of Folsom Dam, the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to inundation due to dam failure. Therefore, there would be no impact.

j) No bodies of water are located in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, the project is not at risk of seiche or tsunami inundation. Because the proposed project is located within an area of flat topography there is no risk of debris flow or mudflow. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

X. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				**X**
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				**X**
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				**X**

a) This development area has been master planned for development, including adequate roads, pedestrian paths, and bicycle paths to provide connections within the community. The project will not physically divide an established community.

b) The project is consistent with the General Plan, West Roseville Specific Plan, and Zoning Ordinance.

c) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans covering the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

XI. Mineral Resources

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 requires the State Geologist to classify land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ's) based on the known or inferred mineral resource potential of that land. The California Divisions of Mines and Geology (CDMG) is responsible for the classification and designation of areas containing–or potentially containing–significant mineral resources. CDMG published Open File Report 95-10, which provides the mineral classification map for Placer County. A detailed evaluation of mineral resources has not been conducted within the City limits, but MRZ's have been identified. There are four broad MRZ categories (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4), and only MRZ-2 represents an area of known significant mineral resources. The City of Roseville General Plan EIR included Exhibit 4.1-3, depicting the location of MRZ's in the City limits. There is only one small MRZ-2 designation area, at the far eastern edge of the City. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				**X**
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				**X**

a, b) The project site is not in an area of the City known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources.

XII. Noise

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City Noise Regulation (RMC Ch. 9.24) will prevent significant non-transportation noise as it relates to items a, b, and c, below. The Ordinance establishes noise exposure standards that protect noise-sensitive receptors from a variety of noise sources, including non-transportation/fixed noise, amplified sound, industrial noise, and events on public property. Standards for transportation noise affecting existing or proposed land uses are established within the City of Roseville 2025 General Plan. Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			**X**	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			**X**	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				**X**
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				**X**

a, c) The City Noise Ordinance is sufficient to mitigate noise from non-transportation sources, but a noise analysis is typically required to address traffic-related noise. Such an analysis was prepared as part of the WRSP EIR, and it concluded that residential development along Blue Oaks Boulevard–where the project is located–would be exposed to roadway noise in excess of General Plan standards (the standard is 60 dB for outdoor activity areas and 45 dB for noise audible inside residences). Cumulative noise levels were calculated to be 70 db when 64 feet from the center of Blue Oaks Boulevard, 65 dB when 139 feet from the center, and 60 dB when 299 feet from the center. A more updated analysis of Citywide traffic noise was included in the Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 EIR, which predicted increased noise levels due to increased anticipated traffic. In the Fiddyment EIR, cumulative noise levels were calculated to be 70 db when 99 feet from the center of Blue Oaks Boulevard, 65 dB when 213 feet from the center, and 60 dB when 460 feet from the center.

As a consequence of these noise volumes, mitigation was included in the WRSP requiring a minimum 6-foot soundwall for all residential projects located along Blue Oaks Boulevard. However, this mitigation did not make a distinction between single-family residential projects and multi-family residential projects, even

though these projects are not exposed to noise in the same manner. While single-family properties will often have backyards oriented toward a busy street such as Blue Oaks, making a soundwall necessary, the outdoor activity areas for apartments tend to be communal facilities located in the center of the development, which is already shielded by large multiple-story buildings. A soundwall to reduce outdoor noise in this context is redundant. This is the case for the proposed project, which has included a common activity area in the center of the complex (a clubhouse, pool, grassy areas, and play structures). There are two layers of three-story apartment buildings in between Blue Oaks Boulevard and this common outdoor area. Thus, the WRSP mitigation for a soundwall is not required for this project in order to reduce outdoor noise.

For indoor noise, standard residential construction provides a 25 dB noise reduction. Thus, exterior noise must exceed 70 dB at the building façade in order to result in an interior noise level that exceeds the 45 dB standard. Based on the more updated data from the Fiddyment EIR, the 70 dB noise contour is located 99 feet from the center of Blue Oaks Boulevard. The site plan indicates that the nearest building façade will be 108 feet from the centerline of Blue Oaks Boulevard. Thus, interior noise levels will also meet General Plan standards for noise. No mitigation is required to offset either interior or exterior noise levels; impacts are less than significant.

b) Surrounding uses may experience short-term increases in groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, these increases are associated with construction activities and would only occur for a short period of time. Based on this, the impact is less than significant.

d) Surrounding uses will experience increases in noise as a result of construction activities. However, these increases would only occur until construction of the project was complete. While the noise generated may be a minor nuisance, the City Noise Regulation standards are designed to ensure that impacts are not unduly intrusive. The regulation includes limits on hours of operation, to avoid nighttime disturbance. Based on this, the impact is less than significant.

e, f) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area, no airports are located within two miles of the project site, and the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impact would occur.

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			**X**	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				**X**
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				**X**

a) The CEQA Guidelines identify several ways in which a project could have growth-inducing impacts (Public Resources Code Section 15126.2), either directly or indirectly. Growth-inducement may be the result of fostering economic growth, fostering population growth, providing new housing, or removing barriers to growth. Growth inducement may be detrimental, beneficial, or of no impact or significance under CEQA. An impact is only deemed to occur when it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be shown that the growth will significantly affect the environment in some other way. While the project in question will induce some level of growth, this growth was already identified and its effects disclosed and mitigated within the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the impact of the project is less than significant.

b, c) The project site is vacant. No housing exists on the project site, and there would be no impact with respect to these criteria.

XIV. Public Services

Fire protection, police protection, and park services are provided by City agencies. The Sierra Vista EIR which analyzed the 2025 General Plan and the EIR for the Specific Plan both addressed the level of public services which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Development Agreements and other conditions have been adopted in all proposed growth areas of the City which identify the physical facilities needed to serve growth, and the funding needed to provide for the construction and operation of those facilities and services. Thus, because the project is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan designations, it will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the Sierra Vista EIR and Specific Plan EIR. In addition, the project has been routed to the various public service agencies, both internal and external, to ensure that the project meets the agencies' design standards (where applicable) and to provide an opportunity to recommend appropriate conditions of approval.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			**X**	
b) Police protection?			**X**	
c) Schools?			**X**	
d) Parks?			**X**	
e) Other public facilities?			**X**	

a) Existing City codes and regulations require adequate water pressure in the water lines, and construction must comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes used by the City of Roseville. Additionally, the applicant is required to pay a fire service construction tax, which is used for purchasing capital facilities for the Fire Department. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

b) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer will be required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for police services. Sales taxes and property taxes resulting from the development will add revenue to the General Fund, which also serves to fund police services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

c) The applicant for this project is required to pay school impact fees at a rate determined by the local school districts. School fees will be collected prior to the issuance of building permits, consistent with City requirements. School sites have already been designated as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

d) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer will be required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for park services. Future park and recreation sites and facilities have already been identified as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

e) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer will be required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for the library system and other such facilities and services. In addition, the City charges fees to end-users for other services, such as garbage and greenwaste collection, in order to fund those services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

XV. Recreation

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			**X**	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			**X**	

a) The Sierra Vista EIR (which updated the General Plan) and the EIR for the Specific Plan both addressed the level of park services–including new construction, maintenance, and operations–which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Given that the project is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan, the project would not cause any unforeseen or new impacts related to the use of existing or proposed parks and recreational facilities. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure less than significant impacts.

b) The proposed project does not include a recreational facility and is not anticipated to result in significant additional demand for recreational opportunities, as the majority of the new jobs created by the project are expected to be filled by people who already reside in the region. Therefore, the project will not significantly impact the existing and planned recreational facilities.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch. 4.44) will fund roadway projects and improvements necessary to maintain the City's Level of Service standards for projects consistent with the General Plan and related Specific Plan. An existing plus project conditions (short-term) traffic impact study may be required for projects with unique trip generation or distribution characteristics, in areas of local traffic constraints, or to study the proposed project access. A cumulative plus project conditions (long-term) study is required if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or Specific Plan and would generate more than 50 pm peak-hour trips. The guidelines for traffic study preparation are found in the City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards–Section 4. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			**X**	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			**X**	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				**X**
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			**X**	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			**X**	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			**X**	

a–b) The project is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan, and thus payment of the Traffic Mitigation Fee is sufficient to ensure consistency with the City's Level of Service standards.

c) The project site is not located within an airport planning area, nor would it affect navigable airspace. Consequently, the proposed project would not necessitate any change in air traffic patterns, nor would it result in safety risks to air traffic. There would be no impact with respect to this criterion.

d) All street improvements and appurtenant facilities (e.g. sidewalks) are required to be designed in conformance with the City's Design and Construction Standards, which provide design direction intended to ensure the safe and appropriate operation of the constructed facilities. The Design and Construction Standards specify that the City Engineer has the authority to require additional standards and regulations if deemed necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The project has been reviewed by City Engineering staff, and has been found to comply with the City's Design and Construction Standards; impacts are less than significant.

e) The City's Design and Construction Standards, in combination with the Uniform Fire Code requirements, are designed to ensure that adequate emergency ingress and egress is provided. Both the City Engineer and the Fire Department have reviewed the project, and have found that the design is consistent with the applicable standards. Existing codes and regulations are sufficient to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

f) A review of the Bicycle Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan found that the project does not conflict with any existing or planned facilities. City Alternative Transportation Division staff also reviewed the project, and found it to be consistent with existing and proposed service plans. The project is consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding non-automotive travel, and will not decrease the performance or safety of such facilities; impacts are less than significant.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

Infrastructure master plans were developed for wastewater, water, and stormwater services for all development in the Specific Plan. These master plans address the location and sizing of distribution/conveyance lines, wells, pump stations, detention basins, and other facilities within the Plan area. Infrastructure financing was defined based on these plans, and fee payments were included in the Development Agreements and Community Facilities Districts to fund the construction and operation of major infrastructure. The construction impacts related to building the major infrastructure were disclosed in the EIR for the Specific Plan, and appropriate mitigation was adopted. Projects which are consistent with the Specific Plan will not result in any new impacts associated with major infrastructure beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. Minor infrastructure (e.g. an on-site sewage line connecting to the major line in the street) is not addressed in the master plans, as it is particular to each project that is ultimately proposed. However, these minor facilities will be installed in locations where grading and other construction activities are already occurring as part of the overall project. No substantial impacts particular to the minor extension of on-site infrastructure will occur.

The most current analysis of water treatment and supply needs was published within the Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 EIR; analyses related to item b and d rely on this document.

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			**X**	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			**X**	
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			**X**	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			**X**	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?			**X**	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			**X**	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			**X**	

a, e) The proposed project would be served by the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality and quantity of

effluent discharged from the Pleasant Grove WWTP. The Pleasant Grove WWTP has the capacity[3] to treat 12 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently treating 7.4[4] mgd. As discussed in Item (b) below, the volume of wastewater generated by the proposed project could be accommodated by the facility. Consequently, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to an exceedance of applicable wastewater treatment requirements. The impact would be less than significant.

b, c) The project is consistent with the Specific Plan and will be required to construct any lines necessary to serve the project, as well as pay fees which fund the operation of the facilities and the construction of major infrastructure. The construction impacts related to building the major infrastructure were disclosed in the EIR for the Specific Plan, and appropriate mitigation was adopted. Minor additional infrastructure will be constructed within the project site to tie the project into the major systems, but these facilities will be constructed in locations where site development is already occurring as part of the overall project; there are no additional substantial impacts specific or particular to the minor infrastructure improvements.

In terms of overall treatment capacity, sewage treatment was discussed in section a, above. An expansion of sewage treatment facilities is not required. Domestic water in the City of Roseville is treated at the City's Water Treatment Plant on Barton Road. The average day water treatment demand at buildout is 52.5 mgd, while the peak demand is 96.1 mgd. The City's water treatment plant currently has a capacity of 100 mgd. The City water treatment facility capacity is greater than the demand, so a facility expansion is not needed to serve the project.

d) Water demand at buildout of the City, which includes the proposed project, is estimated as 63,033 acre-feet per year (AFY), of which 4,478 AFY will be met through recycled water supplies. Thus, the total potable water demand for the City at buildout is currently estimated as 58,826 AFY (total demand minus the demand met through recycled water). The City's maximum surface water supply diversion (from Folsom Reservoir) is 58,900 AFY, which is sufficient water to supply buildout demand in regular and dry years. During drier years, when diversions from Folsom Lake may be reduced to a low of 39,800 AFY, the City uses groundwater supplies combined with usage reduction to make up for surface water shortfalls. The Water Supply Assessment prepared as part of the Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 EIR indicates that there is sufficient groundwater available under buildout conditions during periods when surface water supplies are reduced. The project would not require new or expanded water supply entitlements.

f, g) The Western Placer Waste Management Authority is the regional agency handling recycling and waste disposal for Roseville and surrounding areas. The regional waste facilities include a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL). Currently, the WRSL is permitted to accept up to 1,900 tons of municipal solid waste per day. The WRSL has a total capacity of 36,350,000 cubic yards, has received a total of 10,911,366 cubic yards, and under current projected development conditions has a projected lifespan extending through 2041 (per the Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 EIR). There is sufficient existing capacity to serve the proposed project. Though the project will contribute incrementally to an eventual need to find other means of waste disposal, this impact of City buildout has already been disclosed and mitigation applied as part of the Sierra Vista EIR which updated the General Plan. The project will not result in any new impacts associated with major infrastructure beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the EIR. Environmental Utilities staff has reviewed the project for consistency with policies, codes, and regulations related to waste disposal services and has found that the project design is in compliance.

[3] Waste Discharge Requirements/Monitoring & Reporting Program/NPDES Permit No. CA0079502, Adopted on 28 March 2014

[4] Dave Samuelson, City of Roseville Environmental Utilities, Personal communication, July 30, 2014.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			**X**	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			**X**	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			**X**	

a–c) Long term environmental goals are not impacted by the proposed project. The cumulative impacts do not deviate beyond what was contemplated in the Specific Plan EIR. With incorporation of mitigation measures, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of any wildlife species, or adversely affect human beings.

Attachments

1. Letter from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District
2. CalEEMod Results: Business As Usual
3. CalEEMod Results: 2020 Project

ATTACHMENT 1

Placer County
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

110 Maple Street, Auburn, CA 95603 • (530) 745-2330 • Fax (530) 745-2373 • www.placer.ca.gov/apcd

Thomas J. Christofk, Air Pollution Control Officer

September 30, 2014

SENT VIA: planningdept@roseville.ca.us

Lauren Hocker
Development Services
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

SUBJECT: WRSP, FIDDYMENT RANCH, AVIA AT FIDDYMENT RANCH, NOTICE OF APPLICATION RECEIVED REQUEST FOR COMMENT (PL14-0504)

Dear Planning Staff,

Thank you for submitting the AVIA at Fiddyment Ranch Notice of Application (Project) to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District) for review. The Project proposes construction of a 300 unit apartment complex including a club house, pool, tot lot, BBQ/Shade structure, and associated site improvements. The District provides the following comments for consideration.

In compliance with the West Roseville Specific Plan Mitigation Monitoring Report, the District recommends the incorporation of the following conditions of approval for implementation of the air quality mitigation measures (WRSP MM 4.4-1 thru MM 4.4.7). Modifications to the applicable measures have been made to meet current regulations and/or agreement of measures reached between the City of Roseville and the District.

Construction Related Conditions of Approval

WRSP MM4.4-1 through MM4.4-4

1. The District recommends the requirement of a Dust Control Plan to be submitted and approved by the District prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance.

   1a. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, (whichever occurs first), on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving District approval, of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit.

   1b. The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower of greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the District prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.

   1c. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the District for approval demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average of 20% of NOx and 45% of DPM 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.

2. The District recommends including the following standard notes on the Improvement/Grading Plan, or as an attached form:

    a. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.

    b. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.

    c. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to limit idling to a maximum of 5 minutes.

    d. Idling of construction related equipment and construction related vehicles should not occur within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor.

3. The demolition or remodeling of any structure may be subject to the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) for Asbestos. This may require that a structure to be demolished be inspected for the presence of asbestos by a certified asbestos inspector and that all asbestos materials are removed prior to demolition. For more information, call the California Air Resources Board at (916) 916) 322-6036 or the US. EPA at (415) 947-8704. (Based on Calif. Code Regulations, Title 22)

4. The District's Rules and Regulations are requested to be included as standard notes, or as an attached form to all subsequent Grading/Improvement Plans. A list of the District's Rules and Regulations can be found in the following appendix of the District's CEQA Handbook.

Operational Related Conditions of Approval

WRSP MM4.4-3 through MM4.4-7

5. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall pay into the District's Offsite Mitigation Program to offset the Project's cumulative contribution of criteria pollutants. The fee amount should be based on the amount specified in the Development Agreements, Section 3.15.11 Air Quality Program (2004) and Section 3.27 Air Quality Mitigation Fee (2006).

6. Wood burning or pellet appliances shall not be permitted in multi-family developments. Only natural gas or propane fired fireplace appliances are permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the Floor Plans submitted in conjunction with the Building Permit application. (Based on APCD Rule 225, Section 302.2).

7. Stationary sources or processes (e.g., backup generators, certain types of engines, boilers, heaters, etc.) associated with this project shall be required to obtain an Authority to Construct (ATC) permit from the District prior to the construction. In general, the following types of sources shall be required to obtain a permit: 1). Any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower, 2). Any boiler that produces heat in excess of 1,000,000 Btu per hour, or 3) Any equipment or process which discharges 2 lbs per day or more of pollutants. (Based on APCD Rule 501 and the California Health & Safety Code, Section 39013).

8. The District's Rules and Regulations are requested to be included as standard notes or as an attached form to all subsequent Building Permits for the operational phase of the Project. A list of the District's Rules and Regulations can be found in the following appendix of the District's CEQA Handbook.

Thank you for allowing the District this opportunity to review the project proposal. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 530.745.2333 or agreen@placer.ca.gov if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Angel Green, Associate Planner

ec: Yu-Shuo Chang, Planning & Monitoring Section Supervisor

ATTACHMENT 2

Avia at Fiddyment Ranch

Placer County APCD Air District, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Apartments Mid Rise	300.00	Dwelling Unit	3.36	300,000.00	858
Parking Lot	4.62	Acre	4.62	201,247.20	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	74
Climate Zone	2			**Operational Year**	2005
Utility Company	Roseville Electric				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	793.8	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.029	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - per site plan, buildings cover 3.363 acres, the parking lot and other paved surfaces cover 4.616, and landscaped area covers the remaining 4.005 acres.

Construction Phase -

Architectural Coating - changed to reflect green building code standards

Grading - site size; mass grading

Woodstoves - no fireplaces of any kind proposed

Area Coating - to reflect green building code

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Interior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Exterior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Interior	250.00	50.00
tblAreaCoating	Area_EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	250	50
tblAreaMitigation	UseLowVOCPaintNonresidentialExteriorValue	50	250
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	165.00	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberNoFireplace	30.00	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	105.00	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	10.00	11.90
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	11.90
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	7.89	3.36
tblProjectCharacteristics	OperationalYear	2014	2005
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	15.00	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	15.00	0.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2015								0.1636			0.0000	684.3272	684.3272	0.0916	0.0000	686.2517
2016								8.6800e-003			0.0000	84.8948	84.8948	0.0137	0.0000	85.1814
Total								**0.1723**			**0.0000**	**769.2220**	**769.2220**	**0.1053**	**0.0000**	**771.4330**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2015								0.1636			0.0000	684.3269	684.3269	0.0916	0.0000	686.2513
2016								8.6800e-003			0.0000	84.8947	84.8947	0.0137	0.0000	85.1813
Total								**0.1723**			**0.0000**	**769.2216**	**769.2216**	**0.1053**	**0.0000**	**771.4326**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area											0.0000	3.6387	3.6387	5.8300e-003	0.0000	3.7611
Energy											0.0000	614.3498	614.3498	0.0197	6.3600e-003	616.7359
Mobile								0.4869			0.0000	3,128.9253	3,128.9253	0.2519	0.0000	3,134.2141
Waste											28.0128	0.0000	28.0128	1.6555	0.0000	62.7784
Water											6.2011	53.6109	59.8120	0.6389	0.0154	78.0160
Total								**0.4869**			**34.2139**	**3,800.5247**	**3,834.7386**	**2.5717**	**0.0218**	**3,895.5055**

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area											0.0000	3.6387	3.6387	5.8300e-003	0.0000	3.7611
Energy											0.0000	614.3498	614.3498	0.0197	6.3600e-003	616.7359
Mobile								0.4869			0.0000	3,128.9253	3,128.9253	0.2519	0.0000	3,134.2141
Waste											28.0128	0.0000	28.0128	1.6555	0.0000	62.7784
Water											6.2011	53.6109	59.8120	0.6388	0.0154	78.0061
Total								**0.4869**			**34.2139**	**3,800.5247**	**3,834.7386**	**2.5716**	**0.0218**	**3,895.4956**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.09**	**0.00**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

ATTACHMENT 3

Avia at Fiddyment Ranch

Placer County APCD Air District, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Parking Lot	4.62	Acre	4.62	201,247.20	0
Apartments Mid Rise	300.00	Dwelling Unit	3.36	300,000.00	858

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	74
Climate Zone	2			**Operational Year**	2020
Utility Company	Roseville Electric				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	603.3	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.029	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics - Renewable Energy Portfolio requirements. Refer to Roseville Hotel and Conference Center FEIR for analysis which led to this factor.

Land Use - per site plan, buildings cover 3.363 acres, parking is 4.52, and remaining 4.0 is landscaping.

Construction Phase -

Grading - total site size; mass grading

Architectural Coating - green building code

Woodstoves - no fireplaces of any kind proposed

Area Coating - green building code

Energy Use - d

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Nonresidential_Interior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Exterior	250.00	50.00
tblArchitecturalCoating	EF_Residential_Interior	250.00	50.00
tblAreaCoating	Area_EF_Nonresidential_Exterior	250	50
tblAreaMitigation	UseLowVOCPaintNonresidentialExteriorValue	50	250
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	165.00	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberNoFireplace	30.00	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	105.00	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	10.00	11.90
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	11.90
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	7.89	3.36
tblProjectCharacteristics	CO2IntensityFactor	793.8	603.3
tblProjectCharacteristics	OperationalYear	2014	2020
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	15.00	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	15.00	0.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2015											0.0000	684.3272	684.3272	0.0916	0.0000	686.2517
2016											0.0000	84.8948	84.8948	0.0137	0.0000	85.1814
Total											**0.0000**	**769.2220**	**769.2220**	**0.1053**	**0.0000**	**771.4330**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2015											0.0000	684.3269	684.3269	0.0916	0.0000	686.2513
2016											0.0000	84.8947	84.8947	0.0137	0.0000	85.1813
Total											**0.0000**	**769.2216**	**769.2216**	**0.1053**	**0.0000**	**771.4326**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area											0.0000	3.6387	3.6387	3.5500e-003	0.0000	3.7132
Energy											0.0000	505.2481	505.2481	0.0197	6.3600e-003	507.6342
Mobile											0.0000	2,259.3275	2,259.3275	0.0717	0.0000	2,260.8336
Waste											28.0128	0.0000	28.0128	1.6555	0.0000	62.7784
Water											6.2011	40.7451	46.9462	0.6389	0.0154	65.1502
Total											**34.2139**	**2,808.9593**	**2,843.1732**	**2.3893**	**0.0218**	**2,900.1096**

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area											0.0000	3.6387	3.6387	3.5500e-003	0.0000	3.7132
Energy											0.0000	505.2481	505.2481	0.0197	6.3600e-003	507.6342
Mobile											0.0000	2,259.3275	2,259.3275	0.0717	0.0000	2,260.8336
Waste											28.0128	0.0000	28.0128	1.6555	0.0000	62.7784
Water											6.2011	40.7451	46.9462	0.6388	0.0154	65.1403
Total											**34.2139**	**2,808.9593**	**2,843.1732**	**2.3892**	**0.0218**	**2,900.0997**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.09**	**0.00**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase